

1                   STATE OF CONNECTICUT  
2                   CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

3  
4                   Docket No. 502

5                   Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless  
6                   application for a Certificate of Environmental  
7                   Compatibility and Public Need for the  
8                   construction, maintenance, and operation of a  
9                   telecommunications facility located at 118 Newton  
10                  Road, Woodbridge, Connecticut.

11  
12  
13                  VIA ZOOM AND TELECONFERENCE

14  
15                  Public Hearing held on Tuesday, July 13, 2021,  
16                  beginning at 2 p.m. via remote access.

17  
18  
19                  H e l d   B e f o r e :

20                  JOHN MORISSETTE, Presiding Officer

21  
22  
23  
24  
25                  Reporter:   Lisa L. Warner, CSR #061

1   **A p p e a r a n c e s:**

2       **Council Members:**

3           **ROBERT HANNON**  
4            Designee for Commissioner Katie Dykes  
5            Department of Energy and Environmental  
6            Protection

7           **QUAT NGUYEN**  
8            Designee for Chairman Marissa Paslick  
9            Gillett  
10           Public Utilities Regulatory Authority

11           **ROBERT SILVESTRI**  
12           **DANIEL P. LYNCH, JR.**  
13           **LOUANNE COOLEY**

14       **Council Staff:**

15           **MELANIE BACHMAN, ESQ.**  
16            Executive Director and  
17            Staff Attorney

18           **ROBERT MERCIER**  
19            Siting Analyst

20           **LISA FONTAINE**  
21            Fiscal Administrative Officer

22       **For Applicant, Cellco Partnership d/b/a**  
23       **Verizon Wireless:**

24            **ROBINSON & COLE LLP**  
25            280 Trumbull Street  
              Hartford, Connecticut 06103-3597  
              **BY: KENNETH C. BALDWIN, ESQ.**

26       **For CEPA Intervenor, Woodbridge Newton**  
27       **Neighborhood Environmental Trust**  
28       **(WNNET):**  
29            **LAW OFFICE OF KEITH R. AINSWORTH, ESQ.**  
30            51 Elm Street, Suite 201  
31            New Haven, Connecticut 06105-2049  
32            **BY: KEITH R. AINSWORTH, ESQ.**

1   **A p p e a r a n c e s : (Cont'd)**

2  
3       **For Party, Town of Woodbridge:**

4           **BERCHEM MOSES PC**

5           **1221 Post Road East**

6           **Westport, Connecticut 06880**

7           **BY: NICHOLAS R. BAMONTE, ESQ.**

8  
9  
10  
11       **Also present: Aaron Demarest, Zoom co-host**

12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
**\*\*All participants were present via remote access.**

1 MR. MORISSETTE: This remote public  
2 hearing is called to order this Tuesday, July 13,  
3 2021, at 2 p.m. My name is John Morissette,  
4 member and presiding officer of the Connecticut  
5 Siting Council. Other members of the Council are  
6 Robert Hannon, designee for Commissioner Katie  
7 Dykes of the Department of Energy and  
8 Environmental Protection; Quat Nguyen, designee  
9 for Chairman Marissa Paslick Gillett of the Public  
10 Utilities Regulatory Authority; Robert Silvestri;  
11 Louanne Cooley; and Daniel P. Lynch, Jr.

12 Members of the staff are Executive  
13 Director and Staff Attorney Melanie Bachman;  
14 Robert Mercier, siting analyst; and Lisa Fontaine,  
15 fiscal administrative officer.

16 As everyone is aware, there is  
17 currently a statewide effort to prevent the spread  
18 of the Coronavirus. This is why the Council is  
19 holding this remote public hearing, and we ask for  
20 your patience. If you haven't done so already, I  
21 ask that everyone please mute their computer audio  
22 and their telephones now.

23 This hearing is held pursuant to the  
24 provisions of Title 16 of the Connecticut General  
25 Statutes and the Uniform Administrative Procedure

1 Act upon an application from Cellco Partnership  
2 doing business as Verizon Wireless for a  
3 Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and  
4 Public Need for the construction, maintenance and  
5 operation of a telecommunications facility located  
6 at 118 Newton Road, Woodbridge, Connecticut. This  
7 application was received by the Council on May 13,  
8 2021.

9 The Council's legal notice of the date  
10 and time of this remote public hearing was  
11 published in The New Haven Register on June 10,  
12 2021. Upon this Council's request, the applicant  
13 installed a sign in the vicinity of the proposed  
14 site so as to inform the public of the name of the  
15 applicant, the type of the facility, the remote  
16 public hearing date, and contact information for  
17 the Council, including the website and phone  
18 number.

19 As a reminder to all, off-the-record  
20 communication with a member of the Council or a  
21 member of the Council staff upon the merits of  
22 this application is prohibited by law.

23 The parties and intervenors to this  
24 proceeding are as follows: The applicant, Cellco  
25 Partnership doing business as Verizon Wireless,

1 its representative Kenneth C. Baldwin, Esq. of  
2 Robinson & Cole LLP.

3 The intervenor, CEPA intervenor,  
4 Woodbridge Newton Neighborhood Environmental  
5 Trust, WNNET for an abbreviation, represented by  
6 Keith R. Ainsworth, Esq. of the Law Office of  
7 Keith R. Ainsworth, Esq.

8 And the party to the proceedings is the  
9 Town of Woodbridge represented by Ira W. Bloom,  
10 Esq. of Berchem Moses PC.

11 We will proceed in accordance with the  
12 prepared agenda, a copy of which is available on  
13 the Council's Docket No. 502 webpage, along with  
14 the record of this matter, the public hearing  
15 notice, instructions for public access to this  
16 remote public hearing, and the Citizens Guide to  
17 Siting Council Procedures. Interested persons may  
18 join any session of this session to listen, but no  
19 public comments will be received during the 2 p.m.  
20 evidentiary session.

21 At the end of the evidentiary session  
22 we will recess until 6:30 p.m. for a public  
23 comment session. Please be advised that any  
24 person may be removed from the remote evidentiary  
25 session or the public comment session at the

1 discretion of the Council.

2 The 6:30 p.m. public comment session is  
3 reserved for the public to make brief statements  
4 into the record. I wish to note that the  
5 applicant, parties and intervenors, including  
6 their representatives, witnesses and members, are  
7 not allowed to participate in the public comment  
8 session. I also wish to note for those who are  
9 listening and for the benefit of your friends and  
10 neighbors who are unable to join us for this  
11 remote public comment session that you or they may  
12 send written statements to the Council within 30  
13 days of the date hereof either by mail or email,  
14 and such written statements will be given the same  
15 weight as if spoken during the remote public  
16 comment session.

17 A verbatim transcript of this remote  
18 public hearing will be posted on the Council's  
19 Docket No. 502 webpage and deposited with the  
20 Woodbridge Town Clerk's Office for the convenience  
21 of the public.

22 Please be advised that the Council's  
23 project evaluation criteria under the statute does  
24 not include the consideration of property values.

25 The Council will take a 10 to 15 minute

1 break at a convenient juncture around 3:30 p.m.

2 We have two motions to take care of  
3 this afternoon. The first, on June 22, 2021,  
4 Ochsner Place, LLC submitted a request for  
5 party/CEPA intervenor status. Attorney Bachman  
6 may wish to comment.

7 MS. BACHMAN: Thank you, Mr.  
8 Morissette. As you mentioned, on June 22nd an  
9 abutting property owner, Ochsner Place, LLC,  
10 requested party and CEPA intervenor status. Staff  
11 recommends approval of the request and grouping  
12 Ochsner Place with WNNET under General Statute,  
13 Section 16-50-n(c) on the basis that they have the  
14 same interests and WNNET's responses to the  
15 Council's interrogatories include nine attached  
16 photographs that was taken by the owners of  
17 Ochsner Place, Mark and Michele Greengarden,  
18 residing at 15 Soundview Drive, which is the  
19 Ochsner Place address, and they are listed on the  
20 hearing program for this afternoon under WNNET  
21 Exhibit 2 and their photos A, B, D and F through K  
22 on the hearing program.

23 Now, as grouped parties they maintain  
24 separate counsel, witnesses, party intervenor  
25 designations and of course appeal rights, but they

1 would cross-examine the other parties and  
2 intervenors and appear for cross-examination by  
3 other parties and intervenors together with the  
4 intent to pool resources. And if any of the  
5 parties elect to not be a member of the group,  
6 they can submit written notice to the Council, but  
7 we ask that it be with a condition that the  
8 Greengarden photos that are attached to WNNET's  
9 interrogatory responses are attributed to the  
10 respective party witness before the continued  
11 evidentiary hearing session scheduled for August  
12 31st. Thank you.

13 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney  
14 Bachman.

15 Is there a motion?

16 MR. SILVESTRI: Mr. Morissette, Mr.  
17 Silvestri, I'll move to approve the request with  
18 the grouping, as noted.

19 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr.  
20 Silvestri.

21 Is there a second?

22 MR. HANNON: Hannon, second.

23 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. Hannon.  
24 Any discussion, Mr. Silvestri?

25 MR. SILVESTRI: No discussion. Thank

1 you.

2 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Mr.  
3 Hannon, any discussion?

4 MR. HANNON: I have no discussion.  
5 Thank you.

6 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Mr.  
7 Nguyen, any discussion?

8 MR. NGUYEN: No discussion. Thank you.

9 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Mr. Lynch,  
10 any discussion?

11 MR. LYNCH: No discussion.

12 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Ms.  
13 Cooley, any discussion?

14 MS. COOLEY: I have no discussion.  
15 Thank you.

16 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. And I have  
17 no discussion as well. We'll now move to the  
18 vote.

19 Mr. Silvestri, how do you vote?

20 MR. SILVESTRI: Vote to approve.

21 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr.  
22 Silvestri.

23 Mr. Hannon, how do you vote?

24 MR. HANNON: Vote to approve.

25 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Mr.

1 Nguyen, how do you vote?

2 MR. NGUYEN: Vote to approve. Thank  
3 you.

4 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Mr. Lynch?

5 MR. LYNCH: Vote approval.

6 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Ms.  
7 Cooley?

8 MS. COOLEY: I vote to approve. Thank  
9 you.

10 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. And I also  
11 vote to approve. We have a unanimous decision.  
12 Thank you.

13 Motion number 2, on June 28, 2021,  
14 WNNET submitted a request for a hearing and site  
15 visit. Attorney Bachman may wish to comment.

16 MS. BACHMAN: Thank you, Mr.  
17 Morissette. On June 28, 2021, WNNET submitted a  
18 motion for an in-person hearing and site visit  
19 arguing that the emergency order, or Executive  
20 Order No. 7B issued by Governor Lamont allowing  
21 for state agencies to hold remote hearings,  
22 expired on June 30, 2021 and that a remote hearing  
23 does not meet the requirements under General  
24 Statute Section 16-50m, that a hearing be held at  
25 a location selected by the Council in the county

1 in which the proposed facility or any part thereof  
2 is to be located after 6:30 p.m. for the  
3 convenience of the public.

4 The application was submitted to the  
5 Council on May 13, 2021 when Executive Order 7B  
6 was in effect. Notice of the remote public  
7 hearing was issued on June 4th and published on  
8 June 10th prior to the June 30, 2021 expiration of  
9 Executive Order 7B. Public Act 21-2 took effect  
10 on July 1st of 2021. Section 149 permits remote  
11 hearings under the Freedom of Information Act and  
12 Uniform Administrative Procedure Act until April  
13 30th of 2022 with similar conditions as Executive  
14 Order 7B with regard to access to the meeting by  
15 the public, notification of the agenda, and the  
16 documents to be discussed.

17 As established by the Connecticut  
18 Supreme Court, field reviews are not required by  
19 statute, nor are field reviews an integral part of  
20 the hearing process. Council Interrogatory No. 37  
21 to the applicant requested documentation of a  
22 virtual field review, and a response has been  
23 submitted. Therefore, staff recommends the motion  
24 be denied. Thank you, Mr. Morissette.

25 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney

1 Bachman. Is there a motion?

2 MR. SILVESTRI: Silvestri, Mr.  
3 Morissette, I'll move to deny.

4 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr.  
5 Silvestri. Is there a second?

6 MR. HANNON: Hannon, second.

7 MR. MORISSETTE: We have a motion and a  
8 second to deny the motion. Is there any  
9 discussion? Mr. Silvestri.

10 MR. SILVESTRI: No discussion, Mr.  
11 Morissette. Thank you.

12 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Any  
13 discussion, Mr. Hannon?

14 MR. HANNON: I have no discussion.  
15 Thank you.

16 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Mr.  
17 Nguyen, any discussion?

18 MR. NGUYEN: No discussion. Thank you.

19 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Mr. Lynch,  
20 any discussion? Mr. Lynch, any discussion?

21 MR. LYNCH: As much as I feel  
22 compromised by the Zoom hearings, I have no  
23 discussion.

24 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. Lynch.  
25 Ms. Cooley, any discussion?

1 MS. COOLEY: I have no discussion.  
2 Thank you.

3 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. And I have  
4 no discussion. We'll now move to the vote.

5 Mr. Silvestri, how do you vote?

6 MR. SILVESTRI: Vote to approve the  
7 motion to deny.

8 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr.  
9 Silvestri.

10 Mr. Hannon, how do you vote?

11 MR. HANNON: Vote to approve the motion  
12 to deny. Thank you.

13 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Mr.  
14 Nguyen, how do you vote?

15 MR. NGUYEN: Vote to approve motion to  
16 deny. Thank you.

17 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Mr. Lynch,  
18 how do you vote?

19 MR. LYNCH: I vote to approve the  
20 denial.

21 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Ms.  
22 Cooley, how do you vote?

23 MS. COOLEY: I vote to approve. Thank  
24 you.

25 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, the motion

1 to approve the denial. I also vote to approve the  
2 motion for denial. The motion is approved  
3 unanimously. Thank you.

4 We will now move on to administrative  
5 notices taken by the Council. I wish to call your  
6 attention to those items shown on the hearing  
7 program marked as Roman Numeral I-C, Items 1  
8 through 80 that the Council has administratively  
9 noticed. Does any party or intervenor have an  
10 objection to the items the Council has  
11 administratively noticed?

12 Attorney Baldwin?

13 MR. BALDWIN: No objection, Mr.  
14 Morissette.

15 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney  
16 Baldwin.

17 Attorney Ainsworth?

18 MR. AINSWORTH: No objection, sir.

19 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Attorney  
20 Bloom?

21 MR. BAMONTE: Actually, Attorney  
22 Bamonte sitting in for Attorney Bloom today. But  
23 no objection on behalf of the town.

24 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney  
25 Bamonte.

1 Attorney Green and Attorney Laske?

2 (No response.)

3 MR. MORISSETTE: Attorney Green and  
4 Attorney Laske?

5 MARK GREENGARDEN: Unfortunately --

6 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Go ahead.  
7 I'm sorry, someone was speaking?

8 MR. GREENGARDEN: Unfortunately,  
9 Attorney Green and Attorney Laske were unavailable  
10 for today's hearing.

11 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you for that  
12 information. I very much appreciate that. Okay.  
13 We'll move on accordingly. The Council hereby  
14 administratively notices these items.

15 (Council's Administrative Notice Items  
16 I-C-1 through I-C-80: Received in evidence.)

17 MR. MORISSETTE: We'll now move to the  
18 appearance by the applicant. Will the applicant  
19 present its witness panel for purposes of taking  
20 the oath. Attorney Bachman will administer the  
21 oath.

22 MR. BALDWIN: Thank you, Mr.  
23 Morissette. On behalf of the applicant, my name  
24 is Kenneth Baldwin with Robinson & Cole. The  
25 applicant's witness panel consists of five members

1 who are here in my office in Hartford as well as  
2 one joining us via Zoom. They include Tim Parks.  
3 Tim is a real estate and regulatory specialist  
4 with Verizon Wireless. Seated next to Tim is Ziad  
5 Cheiban, the radio frequency engineer with Verizon  
6 Wireless responsible for the Woodbridge North 2  
7 facility. Next to Mr. Cheiban is Dean Gustafson.  
8 Mr. Gustafson is a senior wetland scientist and  
9 professional soil scientist with All-Points  
10 Technology Corporation. Next is Brian Gaudet, a  
11 project manager with All-Points Technology. And  
12 at the end of the table is Mike Libertine, LEP and  
13 director of siting and permitting with All-Points  
14 Technology. On the Zoom is Sylvester Bhembe the  
15 project manager with Hudson Design Group, the  
16 project engineers. And I offer them to be sworn  
17 at this time.

18 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Attorney  
19 Bachman, please administer the oath.

20 MS. BACHMAN: Thank you, Mr.  
21 Morissette. Could the witnesses please raise  
22 their right hand.

23 Z I A D C H E I B A N,  
24 T I M O T H Y P A R K S,  
25 S Y L V E S T E R B H E M B E,

1 M I C H A E L L I B E R T I N E,  
2 B R I A N G A U D E T,  
3 D E A N G U S T A F S O N,

4 called as witnesses, being first duly sworn  
5 (remotely) by Attorney Bachman, were examined  
6 and testified on their oath as follows:

7 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney  
8 Bachman.

9 Attorney Baldwin, please begin by  
10 verifying all the exhibits by the appropriate  
11 sworn witnesses.

12 DIRECT EXAMINATION

13 MR. BALDWIN: Thank you, Mr.  
14 Morissette. We have four exhibits listed in the  
15 hearing program and then two additions that were  
16 submitted to the Siting Council yesterday. The  
17 exhibits under Roman II, Section B, include the  
18 application and all of its attachments, the bulk  
19 file exhibits which include the Verizon technical  
20 report as well as the Town of Woodbridge zoning  
21 regulations, Inland Wetland regulations and Plan  
22 of Conservation and Development; the applicant's  
23 affidavit of publication, dated May 24, 2021; the  
24 signed protective order for the lease information,  
25 dated June 3; the applicant's responses to the

1 Council's Interrogatories, Set One, dated June  
2 30th; the two new exhibits, we submitted a sign  
3 posting affidavit from Brian Gaudet, and then  
4 lastly, a revised viewshed map which is designed  
5 to replace the viewshed map contained in  
6 applicant's Exhibit 1, attachment 9. And I  
7 actually had to resend that out to all the parties  
8 this morning because there was some corruption of  
9 certain data in the legend, so I did send out  
10 another PDF of that map this morning.

11           So with that information I'll ask our  
12 witnesses, did you prepare or assist in the  
13 preparation of all of those exhibits listed in the  
14 hearing program under Roman II, subsection B,  
15 including the two additional exhibits, the sign  
16 posting affidavit and revised viewshed map, which  
17 we will qualify going forward as the applicant's  
18 exhibits?

19           Mr. Parks.

20           THE WITNESS (Parks): Yes.

21           MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Cheiban.

22           THE WITNESS (Cheiban): Yes.

23           MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Gustafson.

24           THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes.

25           MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Gaudet.

1 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Yes.

2 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Libertine.

3 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes.

4 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Bhembe.

5 THE WITNESS (Bhembe): Yes.

6 MR. BALDWIN: And do you have any  
7 corrections, modifications or clarifications you  
8 want to offer to any of those exhibits?

9 Mr. Parks.

10 THE WITNESS (Parks): No.

11 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Cheiban.

12 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): No.

13 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Gustafson.

14 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): No.

15 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Gaudet.

16 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Yes. One  
17 correction, as Attorney Baldwin stated. On page  
18 15, paragraph 2 of the application, it currently  
19 reads 47 acres of seasonal visibility which was a  
20 carryover from when it was 140 foot original tower  
21 height. That should read 39 acres. That has also  
22 been updated, as was referenced, attachment 9, the  
23 last page on the topographic viewshed has been  
24 revised and submitted as Exhibit 6.

25 I also just want to point out a couple

1 clarifications on the photos under attachment 9  
2 for addresses. Photo 15, there's a discrepancy  
3 between some mapping systems on the streets  
4 directly across from the host property that can be  
5 either Burnt Swamp Road or Prospect Road. So that  
6 should be seen as Newton Road at Prospect Road,  
7 and again, it's directly across from 118. Photo  
8 16 is directly in front of the property at 114  
9 Newton Road, and Photo 17 is also at the corner of  
10 Burnt Swamp and Newton, but that is the Burnt  
11 Swamp south of what could be described as Prospect  
12 and Burnt Swamp Road.

13 MR. BALDWIN: Thank you. Mr.  
14 Libertine, any clarifications or modifications?

15 THE WITNESS (Libertine): I have none  
16 at this time.

17 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Bhembe, any  
18 clarifications or modifications?

19 THE WITNESS (Bhembe): No.

20 MR. BALDWIN: And with those  
21 modifications and clarifications, is the  
22 information contained in those exhibits true and  
23 accurate to the best of your knowledge?

24 Mr. Parks.

25 THE WITNESS (Parks): Yes.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Cheiban.

THE WITNESS (Cheiban): Yes.

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Gustafson.

THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes.

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Gaudet.

THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Yes.

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Libertine.

THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes.

MR. BALDWIN: And Mr. Bhembe.

THE WITNESS (Bhembe): Yes.

MR. BALDWIN: And do you adopt the information contained in those exhibits as your testimony in this proceeding?

Mr. Parks.

THE WITNESS (Parks): Yes.

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Cheiban.

THE WITNESS (Cheiban): Yes.

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Gustafson.

THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes.

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Gaudet.

THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Yes.

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Libertine.

THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes.

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Bhembe.

THE WITNESS (Bhembe): Yes.

1 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Morissette, we offer  
2 them as full exhibits.

3 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney  
4 Baldwin.

5 Does any party or intervenor object to  
6 the admission of the applicant's exhibits?

7 Attorney Ainsworth.

8 MR. AINSWORTH: No, sir. Thank you.

9 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Attorney  
10 Bamonte.

11 MR. BAMONTE: No objection.

12 MR. MORISSETTE: We will skip Attorney  
13 Green and Attorney Laske because they're not  
14 present. The exhibits are hereby admitted.

15 (Applicant's Exhibits II-B-1 through  
16 II-B-6: Received in evidence - described in  
17 index.)

18 MR. MORISSETTE: We will now begin with  
19 cross-examination of the applicant by the Council,  
20 starting with Mr. Mercier and following with Mr.  
21 Silvestri. Mr. Mercier.

22 CROSS-EXAMINATION

23 MR. MERCIER: Thank you. I'll begin by  
24 asking a few questions regarding the radio  
25 frequency modeling for the site, and I'll be

1 referring mostly to the responses to the Council  
2 Interrogatory Exhibit 4 that's near the back of  
3 that document. There's a drive test plot. I'll  
4 also be looking at the coverage plots in the  
5 application that's behind attachment 6, and there  
6 might be part of the text of the application  
7 itself I'll be referring to.

8 Now, on page 7 of the application there  
9 was a statement that there was little to no  
10 wireless service for the 1900 hundred megahertz  
11 and 2100 megahertz frequencies, but it didn't  
12 reference any other frequencies. So I'm  
13 wondering, are those two frequencies, that is the  
14 1900 and 2100 megahertz, are those the only  
15 concern for this site?

16 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): No, the concern  
17 is for all our frequencies. 700 megahertz is our  
18 frequency that propagates the farthest and we  
19 consider our coverage layer, and even at that  
20 frequency we have very poor coverage in that area  
21 in the northeast portion of Woodbridge around  
22 where the State Highway 67 and State Highway 63  
23 and the vicinity around there.

24 MR. MERCIER: Okay. Yes, referring to  
25 the coverage plots for the 700 for the existing,

1 you see the site in the middle of a yellow and  
2 pretty much green area. Can you just tell me what  
3 level of service you have right now for the yellow  
4 zone and how does that impact your wireless  
5 service to customers?

6 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): Yes. So yellow  
7 is what we would consider where it can get outdoor  
8 coverage, so if you're not inside a car. And  
9 green would be vehicular levels. So basically if  
10 somebody is driving along these roads in a  
11 vehicle, they would be able to get service.

12 MR. MORISSETTE: If I could interrupt  
13 for a moment? If you could just state your names  
14 before testifying, that would be helpful.

15 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): Okay. So this  
16 is Ziad Cheiban, the RF engineer with Verizon. We  
17 also submitted what we call a drive test of our  
18 existing system for that area, and that's  
19 basically a test done with a phone inside a  
20 vehicle, and that was submitted as part of Exhibit  
21 4, I believe, in response to the interrogatory.  
22 And that shows that we have marginal to no  
23 coverage along State Highway 67 and State Highway  
24 63.

25 MR. MERCIER: Referring to the drive

1 test, was that conducted at the 700 megahertz  
2 frequency?

3 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): So that, what  
4 it's showing is the 700 megahertz, but it's  
5 basically, it will typically show whatever the  
6 best frequency that the phone could use, and in  
7 that case it is the 700, but even that one is poor  
8 to nonexistent.

9 MR. MERCIER: Do you know the date when  
10 this drive test was conducted?

11 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): I do not have  
12 that in front of me. We can look that up and  
13 answer afterwards.

14 MR. MERCIER: Now, looking at this  
15 drive test, it really focuses on the Route 67 and  
16 63 area. Now, is that the primary concern for  
17 this site?

18 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): I mean, that is  
19 definitely one of the primary concerns, but also  
20 the, you know, the side streets and the  
21 neighborhoods around there. Actually, Newton Road  
22 is also on that drive test. That also has very  
23 poor coverage.

24 MR. MERCIER: I'm sorry, what road was  
25 that?

1 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): Newton Road.

2 MR. MERCIER: Going through the  
3 application, there was a statement. It was  
4 attachment 16. It was like a slide show to the  
5 town, I believe, and one of the slides said, you  
6 know, one of the reasons you needed the site was  
7 it was an area with high concentration of network  
8 extenders. What do you mean by "network  
9 extenders"?

10 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): This is Ziad  
11 Cheiban, RF engineer with Verizon. So network  
12 extenders is a device that you can hook up to your  
13 internet that provides -- it's basically finding a  
14 cell site that can cover your home or a portion of  
15 your home. And these are typically provided to  
16 customers that complain about having no coverage  
17 inside their home.

18 MR. MERCIER: Okay. Thank you.  
19 Looking through the coverage maps, I was looking  
20 at the 1900 megahertz and the 850 megahertz  
21 existing service, and it showed that some of these  
22 sites to the southeast did not have any type of  
23 service in that frequency; is that correct?

24 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): Ziad Cheiban,  
25 RF engineer. Yes, that is correct. We are in the

1 process of augmenting our existing cell sites with  
2 additional frequencies, and at this time these  
3 have not been completed yet.

4 MR. MERCIER: And what would be the  
5 purpose of adding these different frequencies to  
6 existing and also this proposed site?

7 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): The main  
8 purpose would be to increase the capacity. We  
9 also use -- so we are reusing our 850 megahertz  
10 which used to be, this was for our 3G network. We  
11 are using it now to deploy our newer 5G network.

12 MR. MERCIER: Thank you. And just to  
13 go back to the, you had the yellow and the green  
14 you discussed, one was outdoor, the green was for  
15 vehicle. So the purpose of this site, is the  
16 purpose to get in-building coverage as much as you  
17 can?

18 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): Ziad Cheiban  
19 again. Yes, that would be desirable. I mean,  
20 there are multiple objectives. I mean, one of the  
21 key objectives is the highways, but also getting  
22 coverage inside some of those neighborhoods is  
23 desired.

24 MR. MERCIER: Back to attachment 16,  
25 that was the town's slide show. There was a drive

1 test in there, but it looks slightly different  
2 than the one that was submitted with the Council  
3 interrogatory responses. Was there an earlier  
4 drive test or a later drive test or a different  
5 drive test conducted?

6 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): This is Ziad  
7 Cheiban. I just need a minute to look that up.  
8 Just hang on one second. (Pause) Yeah, I believe  
9 that was done at a different time but it shows  
10 similar results, you know, roughly speaking, to  
11 the other one.

12 MR. MERCIER: Thank you. I have a  
13 reference in the technical report, but I also  
14 believe it's in the site search summary, there was  
15 a search area map that had a search ring dated May  
16 2014, and there was a followup by March 2016. So  
17 I'm just trying to determine why the search ring  
18 was shifted to the south. I'm not sure if you're  
19 the individual I should be asking that question  
20 to.

21 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): Yes. This is  
22 Ziad Cheiban again. So this search ring has been  
23 worked on since 2015 -- or maybe 2014, sorry. So  
24 initially we were trying to find something in the  
25 area of concern near the intersection of State

1 Highway 67 and State Highway 63. We were  
2 unsuccessful, and so we shifted the search ring to  
3 the south to increase the likelihood of finding  
4 something.

5 MR. MERCIER: So the initial goal was  
6 to put something up at that intersection, if I  
7 heard you correctly, but if you don't find any  
8 suitable properties then you just move the search  
9 ring to find something that might be good but not  
10 the best. Is that the way to put it?

11 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): Yeah, this is  
12 Ziad Cheiban. That, I think, would be an accurate  
13 statement.

14 MR. MERCIER: Okay. Looking at the  
15 coverage maps again, you know, with the proposed  
16 site there will still be some deficiency along,  
17 coverage deficiency along Route 67 to the north at  
18 700 megahertz. And according to the application,  
19 Cellco intends to install a small cell up in that  
20 area. Do you know, if this site was approved and  
21 constructed at 100 feet, what would be the  
22 deficiency on Route 67 in miles that would need to  
23 be covered, you know, what would be the deficient  
24 coverage remaining if you construct the tower as  
25 proposed?

1           THE WITNESS (Cheiban): This is Ziad  
2 Cheiban. I don't have measurements of that  
3 deficiency, but, you know, just kind of eyeballing  
4 it, it looks around, a little bit less than a  
5 mile.

6           MR. BALDWIN: We can take that as a  
7 homework assignment, Mr. Morissette, and get you a  
8 more precise figure.

9           MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you.

10          MR. MERCIER: I guess related to that  
11 is, would you attempt to leave the green areas out  
12 or maybe focus on one of the two yellow areas  
13 either to the northwest or southeast of kind of  
14 the green area, or is the intent of the small cell  
15 to cover the entire thing?

16          THE WITNESS (Cheiban): I am sorry, can  
17 you repeat the question?

18          MR. MERCIER: If you do install a small  
19 cell in that area, is the intent to cover that  
20 entire area that's marked in yellow and green?

21          THE WITNESS (Cheiban): The intent is  
22 to -- so this is Ziad Cheiban. The intent is to  
23 cover the area in yellow.

24          MR. MERCIER: Would the intent also be  
25 to provide service to the, it looks like

1 residential streets to the southwest of Route 67  
2 that are also in yellow, or is it mainly focused  
3 on the road itself, Route 67, that is?

4 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): Ziad Cheiban.  
5 It will partially cover some of those  
6 neighborhoods but not entirely.

7 MR. MERCIER: Do you have a location  
8 picked out for a small cell? I'm just wondering  
9 if it's a building or is it going to be a utility  
10 pole type installation.

11 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): This is Ziad  
12 Cheiban again. We are searching currently, I  
13 mean, we're searching, looking at utility poles,  
14 but we don't have a location finalized.

15 MR. MERCIER: When you do a utility  
16 pole installation, are the antennas just for 700  
17 megahertz or are other frequencies included?

18 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): This is Ziad  
19 Cheiban. There are limitations to how much  
20 equipment we can put on utility poles by the  
21 utility companies, and so we typically deploy two  
22 frequencies because that's the limit. And so it's  
23 going to be either 700 and 850 or 1900 and 2100.  
24 And again, since we have not finalized the  
25 location, that has not been determined yet.

1 MR. MERCIER: Yes, understood. Thank  
2 you. So when you install the two frequency type  
3 system, what would be the limitations for wireless  
4 service in those areas, if any?

5 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): I mean, the  
6 limitation would -- I mean, in this case, because  
7 we're just using this to supplement the proposed  
8 site, it's not severe. I mean, we can't deploy  
9 the full complement of frequencies that are owned  
10 by Verizon, but, you know, it would be good enough  
11 to provide service to the cars along that highway.

12 MR. MERCIER: For a utility mount small  
13 cell, I guess we'll just call it the typical one,  
14 anybody have any information as to what the cost  
15 of that is? That includes, you know, going on the  
16 pole, installing all the equipment, and any other  
17 type of services or fees that go into constructing  
18 it.

19 MR. BALDWIN: I think we better take  
20 that as a homework assignment as well, Mr.  
21 Morissette.

22 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney  
23 Baldwin.

24 MR. MERCIER: In the interrogatories  
25 the Council requested several plots from some

1 different properties in the area that were  
2 rejected for a cell tower site and one of them --  
3 hold on for a second, please. I'm going to have  
4 to refer to the actual plots. They're in the back  
5 of the interrogatories if anybody is following  
6 along the website. There is a location number 5  
7 that's called 46 Burnt Swamp Road. It was a town  
8 owned parcel according to the site search summary.  
9 Did the town offer this property as a potential  
10 tower location?

11 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): This is Ziad  
12 Cheiban. Yes, that was a property that was  
13 suggested by the town.

14 MR. MERCIER: Did anyone visit the  
15 site, that location, the 46 Burnt Swamp Road  
16 location?

17 MR. BALDWIN: I'm sorry, Mr. Mercier,  
18 you got garbled there for a second. Could you  
19 repeat that question?

20 MR. MERCIER: Yes. For site location  
21 5, that was 46 Burnt Swamp Road, did anybody go  
22 out and examine the site from Cellco?

23 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): This is Ziad  
24 Cheiban. I don't think we visited that location.

25 MR. MERCIER: Okay. Thank you. I

1 guess I'm asking just because I'm looking at the  
2 coverage plots that were submitted from that  
3 location, you know, obviously it was a town  
4 suggested location. I'm looking at the coverage  
5 plot at 700 megahertz, and it appears that it  
6 offers pretty much similar coverage to the  
7 proposed site where there would be a deficiency  
8 along Route 67 which would be the same, pretty  
9 much, as would be offered by the proposed site.  
10 Would you agree with that assessment that 46 Burnt  
11 Swamp Road offers pretty much similar coverage as  
12 the proposed site?

13 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): This is Ziad  
14 Cheiban. So there are two things to note. First  
15 of all, so the property at 46 Burnt Swamp Road is  
16 90 feet lower in elevation than the proposed site  
17 at 118 Newton Road. And this propagation plot was  
18 ran with the tower at 180 feet. But to answer  
19 your question directly, it doesn't do quite as  
20 well as the proposed location even though it is a  
21 lot taller, but it does cover State Highway 63,  
22 you know, in a similar, to a similar extent.

23 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Mr. Mercier,  
24 this is Dean Gustafson from All-Points. Just to  
25 provide you some additional information on 46

1 Burnt Swamp Road, we were provided that property  
2 to look at a desktop level review. We did assess  
3 it to determine what possible design constraints  
4 it could encumber. The property is encumbered  
5 significantly by wetlands. We did provide  
6 coordinates to the RF engineer of a possible  
7 location on that property, but I'd also point out  
8 that there is a conservation easement on that  
9 parcel and it's also located within a public water  
10 supply watershed.

11 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Mr. Mercier,  
12 this is Brian Gaudet with All-Points. Also  
13 looking at that proposed location, that parcel  
14 there, you're talking now 180 foot tower to obtain  
15 similar coverage in a similar setting in that  
16 there are residences essentially surrounding that  
17 parcel. So I think from that standpoint as well  
18 it does not bode quite as well as the current  
19 proposed site.

20 MR. MERCIER: I was looking at some of  
21 the mapping. I think on your visibility map there  
22 is some land trust property around there,  
23 according to your mapping, you modeled at 180. So  
24 there was a conservation easement put on there so  
25 that would preclude development of the parcel, is

1 that correct, your understanding?

2 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): It's listed  
3 on the town's land trust website as having a  
4 conservation easement. Sorry, Dean Gustafson from  
5 All-Points. I'm not sure what restrictions for  
6 development are associated with that conservation  
7 easement.

8 MR. MERCIER: Okay. I'm just  
9 interested because the town suggested it. Thank  
10 you. Moving on to site search, this is the  
11 application, attachment 8, there is a site search  
12 summary in there and description of sites.  
13 Looking at property number 7, did the Woodbridge  
14 Park Association offer this property for potential  
15 use? That's the 7 Meeting House Lane property.  
16 It says the owner is Woodbridge Park Association.

17 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): This Ziad  
18 Cheiban. I believe this one was suggested by the  
19 town.

20 MR. MERCIER: Okay. Woodbridge Park  
21 Association, I'm not sure if that's a town entity  
22 or some other type of entity, however.

23 THE WITNESS (Parks): Tim Parks from  
24 Verizon. We believe this is a town entity.

25 MR. MERCIER: Thank you. Looking at

1 the site search map, I could see parcel 12, which  
2 is a pretty large parcel, and then to the  
3 southeast there's a parcel 2. In between those  
4 two there appears to be some kind of vacant land.  
5 Was there any type of investigation in that  
6 particular area for a potential site?

7 MR. BALDWIN: Just to clarify, Mr.  
8 Mercier, you're looking at the area on that aerial  
9 photograph between the parcel labeled as number 12  
10 and the parcel labeled number 2?

11 MR. MERCIER: That's correct. It looks  
12 like there's two roads that kind of dead end at  
13 some undeveloped land that are marked. I can't  
14 read them right at this second.

15 THE WITNESS (Libertine): White Oak  
16 Lane.

17 MR. MERCIER: Yes, it's one of them.  
18 Yes. Thank you.

19 THE WITNESS (Parks): This is Tim Parks  
20 from Verizon. We did not physically look at the  
21 site.

22 MR. MERCIER: Okay. For parcel 12  
23 that's a preserve that has conservation  
24 restriction; is that correct?

25 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): That is

1 correct. This is Ziad Cheiban. Yes, it does have  
2 a conservation easement again from the  
3 Woodbridge Land Trust.

4 MR. MERCIER: Moving over to the right  
5 side of the diagram, there is the large Regional  
6 Water Authority parcels marked as number 4. Was  
7 the Regional Water Authority receptive to  
8 potentially allowing you to construct a tower on  
9 their land?

10 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Dean  
11 Gustafson from All-Points. We did take a look at  
12 the Regional Water Company land to determine if  
13 there were any possible suitable locations for  
14 siting a cell tower. We determined that all of  
15 that land is either class 1 or class 2 watershed  
16 land. So, in accordance with Connecticut General  
17 Statutes 25-32, there are significant restrictions  
18 for doing any type of commercial development on  
19 water company land, and it has to, at a minimum,  
20 show that there's some, the action has some  
21 benefit to the watershed. So it requires not only  
22 approval by the Regional Water Authority but also  
23 a permit from the Department of Public Health.

24 I was privy to correspondence between  
25 the Regional Water Authority and one of Verizon's

1 site acquisition agents who had reached out, and  
2 the Regional Water Authority essentially responded  
3 saying they were concerned about the lack of  
4 access in proximity to wetlands on that property  
5 and stressed that the property is held for the  
6 protection of the public water supply. They  
7 reiterated that it would require their approval to  
8 put forth a permit to the Department of Public  
9 Health, and indicated that it would be very  
10 unlikely that the Regional Water Authority would  
11 approve such a matter or the Department of Public  
12 Health would approve it.

13 MR. MERCIER: Thank you for that  
14 clarification.

15 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): You're  
16 welcome.

17 MR. MERCIER: In discussions with the  
18 town for potential alternative sites, was any  
19 mention of the Amity High School property, was  
20 that property brought up as a potential tower  
21 location?

22 THE WITNESS (Parks): This is Tim  
23 Parks. No, it was not.

24 MR. MERCIER: I'm going to move on to  
25 Interrogatory 36. It basically stated that, you

1 know, a tree tower could mitigate some of the  
2 views of the tower.

3 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Sorry to  
4 interrupt you, Mr. Mercier. This is Dean  
5 Gustafson from All-Points. I just got some  
6 clarification on a question you had earlier about  
7 what appears to be undeveloped land between on the  
8 site location map properties number 2 and number  
9 12. And there is some open space land there. I  
10 believe it's owned by the Town of Woodbridge. We  
11 did look at that area from a desktop analysis  
12 standpoint. On the mapping it shows, you know,  
13 we're in proximity to White Oak Lane and Forest  
14 Glen Drive. That area of open undeveloped land  
15 that's surrounded by residential, the development  
16 is just to the west of that. There's also a  
17 street in between there called Orchard Street that  
18 appears to provide access to that property.

19 I reviewed that and looked at the  
20 possible design constraints, topography and  
21 wetlands. And the property is encumbered  
22 significantly by a variety of wetland and stream  
23 resources. And with the access provided off of  
24 Orchard Street, I was unable to find any possible  
25 suitable location for a tower site on that parcel

1 without significant wetland and watercourse  
2 resource impacts. So I just wanted to clarify  
3 that for you. Thank you.

4 MR. MERCIER: Thank you. Actually, I  
5 just picked up the revised viewshed map, and I  
6 just noticed that that was marked as blue. It  
7 looks like an extension of the preserve. That's  
8 how it's marked, however. Yeah, I see that's  
9 municipal or some type of land trust property.  
10 Thank you.

11 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Sorry for the  
12 interruption.

13 MR. MERCIER: So for a tree tower,  
14 would Cellco consider installing one at this site  
15 if it was approved?

16 THE WITNESS (Parks): This is Tim Parks  
17 from Cellco. We would consider installing a  
18 monopine, if approved.

19 MR. MERCIER: For the site, the 100  
20 foot tower, do you know roughly what the cost  
21 difference is, you know, would there be a cost  
22 increase to install the tower; and if so, what's  
23 that based on, the foundation, the metal, or a  
24 combination of everything?

25 THE WITNESS (Parks): This is Tim Parks

1 from Cellco. There would be a relatively  
2 significant increase in the cost of the  
3 installation of a monopine as compared to a  
4 monopole. The exact number I can determine during  
5 our break.

6 MR. MERCIER: Thank you. Now, when  
7 Cellco goes ahead and constructs tree towers in  
8 other areas, I'll just say New England or  
9 Connecticut or just the region, does Cellco use  
10 one vendor or are there multiple vendors for the  
11 tree tower design?

12 THE WITNESS (Libertine): This is Mike  
13 Libertine. There have been in the past multiple  
14 vendors. They have consolidated, and at this time  
15 I believe on the east coast you're limited to  
16 either one or two.

17 MR. MERCIER: Okay. I guess my  
18 question has to do with, you know, given the new  
19 technology today and larger platforms and more  
20 equipment on the platforms, I just want to know,  
21 if anybody has seen the current design, if the  
22 branches would conceal the platforms and antennas  
23 within, you know, on the tree tower, would there  
24 be concealment?

25 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): This is Brian

1 Gaudet with All-Points. So the monopine towers  
2 can be designed essentially to the request of the  
3 tower developer, landlords, any other party that  
4 has an interest in the design. So they can be  
5 sort of that standard straight up and down every  
6 branch is the same width. You can have them  
7 designed to bow out more at the bottom, have a  
8 conical top to make it appear a little bit more  
9 natural. You can increase the branching in  
10 between, you know, the per foot branching. So  
11 there's a lot of different things you can do to  
12 conceal each array appropriately.

13 THE WITNESS (Libertine): This is Mike  
14 Libertine. Yeah, they're essentially custom to  
15 the design for that particular arrangement. And  
16 as another carrier comes to use it, they would do  
17 a similar arrangement so that it would conceal the  
18 antennas and the appurtenances on the tower  
19 itself.

20 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Brian Gaudet.  
21 Just to add to the design, some of the design  
22 features. When you're looking to create sort of  
23 that more natural looking evergreen, you do have  
24 to add some additional height to the tower in the  
25 form of branching. That can be anywhere between 5

1 to 15 feet depending on how wide the antenna array  
2 at the top is to make it look natural.

3 MR. MERCIER: Thank you. I just want  
4 to ensure for a tree tower that the antennas are  
5 concealed within the branching. So I assume --  
6 for a full platform how far out would these  
7 branches have to extend, anybody have any idea?  
8 Say if there was a platform put on a 100 foot  
9 height of this tower, you know, how far out would  
10 the antennas have to go to conceal them?

11 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Brian Gaudet.  
12 You're talking 12 foot arrays is a pretty standard  
13 width. So you'd be looking at anywhere between 13  
14 and 14 feet to really mask the antennas behind  
15 that outside branching. (Pause) So sorry, good  
16 point, 6 feet either side of the pole. So you're  
17 looking 7 to 8 feet per branch out from the  
18 monopole center, so a total width of about 13, 14  
19 feet.

20 MR. MERCIER: Thank you. If a tree  
21 tower was used, would painting the antennas help,  
22 help conceal them within the branch structure?

23 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Brian Gaudet.  
24 There's painting that can be done. There's also,  
25 they make some mesh socks that help blend it in,

1 sort of a greenish camouflage color. So you can  
2 certainly hide them, whereas you've got sort of  
3 the beige or white face of the standard panel  
4 antennas which would stick out more in green  
5 branching.

6 MR. MERCIER: For the socks, the  
7 antenna socks I'll call them, you put them on top  
8 of the antennas, it looks like needles, are there  
9 any type of performance issues or maintenance  
10 issues with those socks, you have to take them off  
11 to fix antennas or anything of that nature?

12 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): This is Ziad  
13 Cheiban. Yeah, they probably would need to be  
14 taken off to, you know, do maintenance on the  
15 antennas. I am not aware of any performance  
16 issues with them.

17 MR. MERCIER: Thank you. For this  
18 particular tower, did the town express any  
19 interest in locating any emergency antennas on top  
20 of the tower?

21 THE WITNESS (Parks): This is Tim Parks  
22 with Cellco. They have not.

23 MR. MERCIER: If an emergency provider  
24 wanted to go on the tower, I'm going to presume at  
25 the top, and they install whip antennas, if a tree

1 tower is used, how could the whip antennas be  
2 accommodated?

3 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Brian Gaudet.  
4 Typically the whip antennas are installed on a  
5 much less substantial mount than what you would  
6 see for a low profile platform that the carriers  
7 use. So I would assume that there would be enough  
8 space where they could mount it. As far as  
9 screening goes from a visibility standpoint, as  
10 you mentioned, they're typically whip antennas,  
11 very thin profile. It would be, I think, a little  
12 bit excessive to try and design the tree to screen  
13 a 15 foot whip antenna on top, but we found that  
14 the visibility of those whip antennas outside of a  
15 quarter mile is almost indiscernible to the naked  
16 eye.

17 THE WITNESS (Libertine): This is Mike  
18 Libertine. I'd also add that there's no guarantee  
19 that they would want the top spot. We've often  
20 seen those emergency providers, as long as there's  
21 no interference with the carriers, coming down a  
22 little bit lower and affixing and also be hidden  
23 within the branching itself. So it really depends  
24 on their need.

25 MR. MERCIER: Thank you. I just have a

1 couple questions about the site plans. I think  
2 that's application attachment 1. I'm just looking  
3 at site plan C-1. I believe that's the abutter's  
4 plan. It just kind of gives a general oversight  
5 of the site. Again, this is plan C-1. And I'm  
6 looking at the proposed lease area. Why was this  
7 particular location chosen on the site parcel?

8 THE WITNESS (Parks): This is Tim Parks  
9 from Cellco. This is where the landlord directed  
10 us for the tower location.

11 MR. MERCIER: Okay. I wasn't sure if  
12 the landlord would be amenable to moving the tower  
13 location and compound slightly, I guess, north  
14 just so the height is equidistant from the north  
15 and south property lines. I don't know if you had  
16 that discussion previously or is this the only  
17 location the landlord wanted.

18 THE WITNESS (Parks): This is Tim Parks  
19 from Cellco. We could speak to the landlord on  
20 that.

21 MR. MERCIER: In looking at the plan, I  
22 just saw a note that there would be an 8 foot high  
23 chain link fence. Any type of treatment plan for  
24 the fence or grass or any other type of visual  
25 mitigation?

1 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Bhembe.

2 THE WITNESS (Bhembe): Currently the  
3 site itself doesn't have any screening, but  
4 screening can be added to it to be in the form of  
5 green slats if that is required.

6 MR. MERCIER: Okay. So maybe even, is  
7 there any issue with putting up a decorative wood  
8 or a vinyl type fence instead of a chain link?

9 THE WITNESS (Bhembe): A wood fence can  
10 also be done. There's no issue with that.

11 MR. MERCIER: And one other note I saw  
12 in the site plan, it showed a floodlight. Can you  
13 just tell me how often it operates, is it on all  
14 night, or is it on certain times when a technician  
15 might come to the site when it's dark?

16 THE WITNESS (Bhembe): It's automated  
17 and it only functions only when the technician is  
18 on site on a timer. So the technician will turn  
19 it on, and it will turn off at a specific time.

20 MR. MERCIER: Thank you. That was my  
21 next question. Thank you very much. I have no  
22 other questions at this time. Thank you.

23 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr.  
24 Mercier. We'll now continue with  
25 cross-examination by Mr. Silvestri followed by Mr.

1 Hannon.

2 Mr. Silvestri.

3 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you, Mr.  
4 Morissette. And good afternoon all. I have a  
5 couple follow-up questions to what Mr. Mercier had  
6 posed. And I'd like to begin with the potential  
7 small cell in the area of Route 67. Could you  
8 explain how a small cell coverage would actually  
9 work?

10 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): Mr. Silvestri,  
11 this is Ziad Cheiban. Can you be more specific  
12 about what you're looking for?

13 MR. SILVESTRI: Well, you would install  
14 a small cell. How is it connected to the system?

15 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): Okay. This is  
16 Ziad Cheiban again. So it is connected through  
17 fiber back to a hub location which has not been  
18 determined. And it has equipment right on the  
19 utility pole that would have power and fiber  
20 connected to it and then connected to the antenna.

21 MR. SILVESTRI: So is it the fiber that  
22 drives the connection for coverage or is it the  
23 antennae?

24 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): So the fiber  
25 provides what we call the backhaul that basically

1 connects back to, you know, the digital processing  
2 equipment on the pole itself, there will be a  
3 radio, and that radio is connected through copper  
4 cabling to the antennae, and that's what transmits  
5 the radio energy.

6 MR. SILVESTRI: Got you. Okay. And  
7 then it was mentioned earlier that for existing  
8 utility poles, if you were to put up a small cell,  
9 there would be a number of restrictions. What  
10 about new poles, if you were to set a new pole,  
11 would you have the similar restrictions that you  
12 might have on a utility owned pole?

13 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): This is Ziad  
14 Cheiban again. So if we were to put a Verizon  
15 owned pole, assuming we can find a property owner  
16 that would allow us to do that, we would not have  
17 the same restrictions as we do when we use the  
18 poles that are owned by UI.

19 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you. One other  
20 followup right now with what Mr. Mercier had posed  
21 goes back to the monopine. In looking at stealth  
22 designs, was a watch tower ever considered instead  
23 of a monopine or the regular monopole?

24 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Brian Gaudet  
25 with All-Points. This location, being fairly

1 wooded with really no substantial height in any  
2 buildings, a watch tower would look a little bit  
3 out of place here at 100 feet tall. You're  
4 adding, the viewshed of a watch tower, you're  
5 talking at least 3 or 4 poles to support that.  
6 You're talking, the watch tower at the top of it,  
7 substantially wider than what you would see with a  
8 monopole.

9           The monopine in this location, I'll  
10 point you to photo 1 in the photo simulations,  
11 aside from photo 1, photo 15 and photo 16, where  
12 you're going to see this tower, a monopine would  
13 blend in fairly well. There's a significant  
14 amount of seasonal visibility. Most of the  
15 visibility is within roughly .3 miles of the site.  
16 And there is some substantial screening with the  
17 exception of the cleared fields on the host  
18 property. So a monopine would do some good  
19 screening to a number of locations where you would  
20 have these views, but again, photo 1 is such a  
21 stark contrast to what is there today that a  
22 monopine would really stick out to some of these  
23 immediate nearby abutting properties.

24           MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Thank you for  
25 your response. One other followup I had to Mr.

1 Mercier. When he was talking about the location  
2 of, or potential location of the tower on the  
3 property, you had mentioned that it would be a  
4 discussion with the landowner if it could shift  
5 one way or another. As it's proposed right now,  
6 however, if I measured correctly, I believe that  
7 the proposed tower will be located about 64 feet  
8 from the western property line. So the question I  
9 have for you, is there a hinge point that would  
10 keep the tower within the subject property in the  
11 event of a catastrophic failure?

12 THE WITNESS (Parks): This is Tim Parks  
13 from Cellco. We can design it into the tower.

14 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. So there's a  
15 potential, should the project be approved, of  
16 possibly working with the landlord to shift the  
17 whole compound or looking at that hinge point,  
18 correct?

19 THE WITNESS (Parks): That is correct.

20 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Thank you. And  
21 if I have my notes correct, you're proposing a 30  
22 kilowatt generator, propane powered, with an  
23 approximately 500 gallon propane tank. What's the  
24 run time that you anticipate?

25 THE WITNESS (Parks): This is Tim Parks

1 from Cellco. Those vary depending on the location  
2 of the site. Typically they can run for five to  
3 seven days on a full tank of fuel.

4 MR. SILVESTRI: And what provisions do  
5 you have for storm preparation, you know, based on  
6 what we just had with Elsa coming through, what do  
7 you do to prepare your sites to make sure we got  
8 coverage that would continue during such storms?

9 THE WITNESS (Parks): This is Tim Parks  
10 from Cellco. We do top off all of our tanks for  
11 our sites, as many as we can. We also ensure that  
12 the battery backup is available.

13 MR. SILVESTRI: And you would -- go  
14 ahead.

15 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): Sorry. This is  
16 Ziad Cheiban. I just wanted to add that we also  
17 have contractors, you know, we put them on standby  
18 to refuel the generators when there's a storm or  
19 other significant event.

20 MR. SILVESTRI: Understood. Thank you.  
21 And the generator would be exercised once a week  
22 to make sure it's operational; is that correct?

23 THE WITNESS (Parks): That is correct,  
24 for about 10 to 15 minutes.

25 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you. Okay. If I

1 can have you reference page 23 of the application.  
2 This is the application narrative. And looking at  
3 that table, the total estimated cost is listed at  
4 425,000, but the items included in that estimate  
5 only total 245,000. So, I'm looking to see what  
6 accounts for the \$180,000 difference.

7 MR. BALDWIN: Clearly a typo in there  
8 somewhere, Mr. Silvestri. And we'll investigate  
9 that and take that as a homework assignment, if we  
10 can.

11 MR. SILVESTRI: Yeah, if you could take  
12 that one along with the question Mr. Mercier had  
13 added about the additional cost on the monopine,  
14 that would be appreciated.

15 MR. BALDWIN: Yes.

16 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you. Now, I want  
17 to try to understand correctly. There is a 250  
18 foot lattice tower that's on West Rock Ridge. I  
19 believe the address is 1055 Wintergreen Avenue.  
20 There is a relatively new cell tower that's over  
21 on Woodin Street also in Hamden. Could you  
22 explain what remains, what the interaction might  
23 be between those cell towers and what you're  
24 proposing on Newton Road?

25 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): This is Ziad

1 Cheiban. The tower on West Rock Ridge covers the  
2 southern portion of State Highway 63. It really  
3 does not interact or overlap with the proposed  
4 facility very much. The other tower that you  
5 mentioned does not cover this area at all.

6 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. But when you say  
7 "very much," there is some overlap with what  
8 you're proposing for the existing tower, correct?

9 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): There is a very  
10 small amount of overlap.

11 MR. SILVESTRI: All right. So related  
12 to that, is the 250 foot lattice tower on West  
13 Rock Ridge, is that still slated to go away?

14 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): This is Ziad  
15 Cheiban. So our sites, our equipment that is on  
16 that tower is slated to be decommissioned, but not  
17 the tower itself.

18 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. So I guess an  
19 obvious question I'm going to pose, why not keep  
20 your equipment on that lattice tower and try to  
21 hook up something along the lines of small cells  
22 to the area that you're looking to provide  
23 additional coverage?

24 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): This is Ziad  
25 Cheiban again. So we have -- there are several

1 constraints or issues with small cells. One of  
2 them is that we cannot put power back up on the  
3 poles owned by United Illuminating. So in case of  
4 a storm, anything like that, we would lose  
5 service. The other issue is they don't allow us  
6 to deploy all of the frequencies that we currently  
7 own because of the restrictions on the equipment  
8 that we can attach to these poles. So these are  
9 general concerns.

10 Now, specifically to this area we have  
11 looked and there aren't -- there are very few  
12 poles that are unencumbered by electrical  
13 equipment and that we can actually use.  
14 Specifically, I mean, we're not able to come up  
15 with a design that would cover this area. In many  
16 places the trees are actually taller than the  
17 utility poles in this area of Woodbridge which  
18 would block, you know, some of the radio signal.

19 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. But if I'm  
20 hearing correctly, you're looking at existing  
21 utility poles at this point. Again, I had posed  
22 the question, one, about new poles in relation to  
23 Route 67, but also what about buildings, there's a  
24 number of buildings within the area ranging from  
25 Blue Check Deli, which is up on 63, you have a

1 number of buildings, Solun Tapas over on Amity  
2 Road, Crest Lincoln Mercury, People's Bank, a  
3 number of other facilities that might be potential  
4 for putting on rooftop small cells. Could you  
5 tell me about the potential to use those  
6 facilities?

7 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): This is Ziad  
8 Cheiban. I have not evaluated these buildings, so  
9 I cannot really answer that.

10 MR. BALDWIN: We can take a look at  
11 some of those buildings, Mr. Silvestri, between  
12 now and the next hearing and report back on what I  
13 believe to be your question related to small cell  
14 opportunities.

15 MR. SILVESTRI: Attorney Baldwin, I  
16 would appreciate that. Again, the next series of  
17 questions I have for you are also looking at what  
18 we might have for alternatives. And again, I  
19 don't know if what I just mentioned with West Rock  
20 Ridge small cells on existing buildings up and  
21 down Amity Road might do it, but you could provide  
22 that information.

23 But the followup I have for you, going  
24 back to the site search summary, you have area 4  
25 that is the water company property there, and the

1 one I'm looking at, in particular, is right near  
2 Lake Dawson on Route 69. I drive that from time  
3 to time. I know there's a cell tower as I drive  
4 north. It's on the left-hand side. And I don't  
5 know if Verizon is on that cell tower, so let me  
6 ask you that first. Is Verizon on that cell tower  
7 just south of area 4 on your site location map  
8 near Lake Dawson?

9 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): This is Ziad  
10 Cheiban. No, we are not currently on this tower.

11 MR. SILVESTRI: You're not on there,  
12 okay. Because you investigated areas around that  
13 tower, is there a potential to locate your antenna  
14 on that tower to provide coverage in the areas  
15 that are needed?

16 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): This is Ziad  
17 Cheiban. That location is significantly lower in  
18 elevation than the area we're trying to cover, and  
19 it is also more than 2 miles away. So it would  
20 not really provide the coverage that we need where  
21 we need it.

22 MR. SILVESTRI: I don't know the  
23 elevation of the existing cell tower, so that's a  
24 little bit difficult for me to put in perspective.  
25 But when you mentioned it's 2 miles away, why then

1 did you investigate all the areas for the Regional  
2 Water Company if the site I'm mentioning is  
3 located right near that, wouldn't areas 4 that you  
4 have on the site search be too far away based on  
5 what you just said?

6 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): This is Ziad  
7 Cheiban. Yes, we investigated them because they  
8 were suggested by the town.

9 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. But you really  
10 didn't go into -- or did you go into detail about  
11 trying to locate on that existing tower?

12 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): This is Ziad  
13 Cheiban. We did not -- I mean, we knew that that  
14 tower was too far. Basically it covers more Route  
15 69, and it would not cover the Route 67 and 63  
16 which is where we needed the coverage.

17 MR. SILVESTRI: I hear what you're  
18 saying. Again, I'm going to put it into the small  
19 cell context that I mentioned before that I don't  
20 know if there's a possibility of trying to  
21 relocate -- or locate on that existing tower and  
22 again looking at small cells somewhere along Route  
23 63 that might provide the same type of coverage  
24 that you're looking for. So again, I'm still on  
25 the small cell thing as potential options, if you

1 will, rather than building a new cell tower.

2 Let's see. Mr. Morissette, looking at  
3 my notes, I believe I covered everything at this  
4 point that I wanted to. So I think I'll stop  
5 there. Thank you.

6 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr.  
7 Silvestri. We'll now move on to cross-examination  
8 by Mr. Hannon and followed by Mr. Nguyen.

9 Mr. Hannon.

10 MR. HANNON: Thank you. On page 9 of  
11 the application it talks about Woodbridge South,  
12 Woodbridge North, Woodbridge East, Westville West.  
13 What are the heights of those towers?

14 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): This Ziad  
15 Cheiban. I think we're going to have to take that  
16 one as homework because I don't have that  
17 information in front of me.

18 MR. HANNON: Okay. I was just curious.  
19 I guess this sort of follows up a little bit with  
20 what Mr. Mercier was asking and Mr. Silvestri.  
21 But you have a statement in here, "Cellco is aware  
22 of no viable and currently available alternatives  
23 to its system design for carriers licensed by the  
24 FCC." This is on the bottom of page 11. Can you  
25 please provide some fill-in material as to where

1 you come up with that statement? I'm just looking  
2 for some supporting rationale behind that  
3 statement.

4 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): This is Ziad  
5 Cheiban. The statement is basically saying that  
6 there are no existing towers or existing small  
7 cells that would provide an alternative to what  
8 we're proposing, or existing buildings.

9 MR. HANNON: I didn't read that as a  
10 tower because it's talking about no viable and  
11 currently available alternatives, so I wasn't  
12 thinking about that as another tower. So I  
13 apologize if I misconstrued that.

14 On page 13 you talk a little bit about  
15 how the initial target height was 140 feet and  
16 then after talking to the town and some of the  
17 neighboring property owners you settled on a  
18 height of 100 feet. What went into that decision  
19 to go from 140 down to 100, because it seems like  
20 if 140 was the height you were looking for,  
21 dropping it 40 feet could be pretty considerable  
22 in coverage. So what were the trade-offs from  
23 going from 140 to 100?

24 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): This is Ziad  
25 Cheiban. So we are trying to compromise and

1 reduce -- the main idea was to try to reduce the  
2 visibility, and going from 140 to 100 reduces the  
3 visibility, and at the same time we added a  
4 proposed small cell along Route 63 to compensate  
5 for the weak coverage in that area. I'm sorry, I  
6 think it's Route 67.

7 MR. HANNON: And that would be just one  
8 small cell or would it be more than one?

9 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): We're currently  
10 proposing only one.

11 MR. HANNON: Okay. The next comment I  
12 have, it's sort of a minor comment, but you state  
13 on page 7, the Environmental Assessment Statement  
14 under the Land, "No trees or ground vegetation  
15 will need to be cleared and only minimal grading."  
16 But I'm looking at map C-2. And is it standard  
17 practice to keep trees in a compound that are  
18 going to be 10 feet away from the tower, because I  
19 don't remember any cell tower sites previously  
20 before that had the trees in the compound.

21 THE WITNESS (Bhembe): Sylvester here.  
22 The trees in the compound will be removed. There  
23 are 6 inch diameter trees were actually marked and  
24 they will be removed. And the limit --

25 MR. HANNON: That's kind of what I

1 thought. But again, you've got a statement that  
2 no trees are going to be cut down on the site, so  
3 that may be something that needs to be fixed.

4 I'm jumping to Tab 8. I know we've  
5 talked about some of the sites that could have  
6 been looked at. In particular, I'm interested in  
7 number 6, the town's public works garage. I'm  
8 sure that you have read the prefile testimony from  
9 Mr. Feldman, and he's stating in his document that  
10 one alternative site that was offered to Verizon  
11 was at the town garage. I'm assuming that the  
12 town public works garage, number 6, is the same  
13 thing that Mr. Feldman was referring to.

14 But here's kind of where I'm going with  
15 this: You say this parcel is 169 feet lower than  
16 the proposed site at 118 Newton Road. So to me  
17 that's, what, roughly a 270 foot high tower. So  
18 what are the differences in cost, visibility,  
19 things of that nature? So it's probably a couple  
20 of folks making some comments on this. I know  
21 Mr. Libertine usually deals a lot with some of the  
22 viewsheds and things of that nature. But if you  
23 did go on that site, would the tower need to be  
24 about 270 feet to accomplish the same thing you're  
25 trying to do at 118 Newton Road?

1 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): Ziad Cheiban.

2 So I can address the RF propagation aspect. So  
3 that location is not only lower, it's also farther  
4 away from the target area. And I don't know that  
5 a 270 foot tower would even provide the coverage  
6 that we need. But the other thing to note is that  
7 any time you go above 200 feet, the tower needs to  
8 be lit per FAA regulation. It becomes very  
9 visible. So it is not a good option, but I'll let  
10 the others speak to the visibility, high  
11 visibility aspects.

12 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): This is Brian  
13 Gaudet with All-Points. So there's a couple  
14 factors with that Meetinghouse Lane location.  
15 There are -- well, it's not as populated from a  
16 residential standpoint. There are a number of  
17 open fields down that way. As you come in towards  
18 Meetinghouse Lane, it's much more level than some  
19 of the terrain farther up Newton Road. At 270  
20 feet, as Ziad mentioned, you would need to light  
21 the tower, there's that factor going to it as  
22 well. But 270 feet is going to stick out wherever  
23 you put it.

24 I would like to point out too that  
25 Meetinghouse Lane has a couple properties, at

1 least one property that is registered on the  
2 National Register of Historic Places. A 270 foot  
3 tower right in front of that building probably  
4 would not go over well with SHPO. You're also  
5 now, you're shifting the visibility, and I think  
6 from a cost standpoint you now have to, you're  
7 spending an exponential amount of money on the  
8 electric to run those lights, the maintenance to  
9 replace those lights. If the tower needs to be  
10 painted from an FAA perspective, there's the  
11 initial cost for that, plus the maintenance on  
12 that. So from an operational standpoint, the cost  
13 goes up pretty significantly.

14 MR. HANNON: Again, there was a  
15 specific comment made, so I just wanted to get  
16 something on the record as to what the issue was  
17 for this particular site. I don't believe I have  
18 anything else at this point in time, so thank you.

19 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. Hannon.  
20 I think it would be a perfect time to take a  
21 15-minute break. We'll get back to the hearing at  
22 3:45. At that time Mr. Nguyen will commence with  
23 his cross-examination. Thank you. We'll see you  
24 at 3:45.

25 (Whereupon, a recess was taken from

1 3:30 p.m. until 3:45 p.m.)

2 MR. MORISSETTE: We'll now continue  
3 with cross-examination by Mr. Nguyen, followed by  
4 Mr. Lynch. Thank you.

5 Mr. Nguyen.

6 MR. NGUYEN: Thank you, Mr. Morissette.  
7 And good afternoon, everyone. Let me start with  
8 attachment number 8, the site search summary. I'm  
9 looking on page 3 and page 4, and I notice that  
10 there's about nine sites that were labeled -- were  
11 rejected by RF design engineers. I suppose that  
12 would be you, Mr. Cheiban, and your group; is that  
13 correct?

14 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): Yes, that would  
15 be me.

16 MR. NGUYEN: Now, of all those sites  
17 that were rejected by you, would you physically  
18 visit those sites?

19 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): No, I did not  
20 physically visit those sites. I just evaluated  
21 them from the desktop.

22 MR. NGUYEN: So those sites were  
23 rejected by you and your group. Is it you  
24 personally, or is it a group of engineers?

25 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): It is me

1 personally.

2 MR. NGUYEN: Now, to the extent that  
3 you were not physically at the site, so what are  
4 the parameters that lead you to reject those  
5 sites?

6 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): This is Ziad  
7 Cheiban. So I basically run a propagation map and  
8 compare to what our coverage objective is.

9 MR. AINSWORTH: Mr. Acting Chair, I  
10 notice I'm hearing whispering in the room, and  
11 it's not usually practice to coach witnesses.

12 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney  
13 Ainsworth. Yes, if we could keep the whispering  
14 to a minimum, please. If you need to go off the  
15 record, please say so.

16 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Morissette, it is not  
17 uncommon for attorneys to speak to their witnesses  
18 during cross-examination. I'm not coaching our  
19 witnesses in any way. They are very capable of  
20 answering these questions. Thank you.

21 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Thank you.  
22 Please continue.

23 MR. NGUYEN: Thank you. In response to  
24 Question Number 17, I believe Verizon indicated  
25 that the proposed facility is capable of providing

1 5G wireless services; is that correct?

2 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): This is Ziad  
3 Cheiban. Yes, that is correct.

4 MR. NGUYEN: And does the company plan  
5 to provide the 5G in the future?

6 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): Yes, we are.

7 MR. NGUYEN: And I know there was a lot  
8 of, there was some discussions regarding the low  
9 band and midband frequencies that Mr. Mercier  
10 raised. Now, what about the higher frequency, the  
11 28 and 39 gigahertz frequencies known as the  
12 millimeter-wave spectrum. Does Verizon intend to  
13 utilize that frequency in the future?

14 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): This is Ziad  
15 Cheiban. We do not intend to use the 28 gigahertz  
16 or 39 gigahertz at this site in the foreseeable  
17 future.

18 MR. NGUYEN: I'm sorry, you do or you  
19 don't?

20 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): We do not.

21 MR. NGUYEN: Could you please explain  
22 why.

23 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): Yes. This is  
24 Ziad Cheiban. So the 28 gigahertz and 39  
25 gigahertz have a very small coverage footprint,

1 and they are typically used in dense urban areas  
2 or urban areas, and in this specific location it  
3 would not make a lot of sense to deploy these. We  
4 will, however, be deploying a newly acquired  
5 C-band which is around 3700 megahertz or 3.7  
6 gigahertz at this site, and that is also capable  
7 of 5G.

8 MR. NGUYEN: Now, with respect to the  
9 small cell application that was raised by Mr.  
10 Mercier and Mr. Silvestri regarding the small cell  
11 deployment, would those frequencies,  
12 millimeter-wave spectrum, would be more  
13 accommodated by the small cell applications?

14 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): This is Ziad  
15 Cheiban again. Again, I mean, due to the kind of,  
16 the environment that this site is, where this site  
17 is located, which is heavily wooded, the houses  
18 are far apart, the 28 gigahertz and 39 gigahertz  
19 would not, you know, it would be extremely  
20 difficult to get continuous coverage at those  
21 frequencies. They work pretty well in more  
22 built-up areas where the residences or buildings  
23 are closer together, but in this environment here  
24 the houses are pretty far apart, and there is a  
25 lot of trees, it would simply not be able to -- I

1 mean, we would not get good coverage out of those  
2 frequencies even with small cell.

3 MR. NGUYEN: But you are comparing the  
4 limitation of propagation and line of sight, you  
5 are talking about the macro cell towers, or are  
6 you talking about the small cell applications?

7 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): The way I  
8 understood the question, you were asking if we  
9 would deploy the millimeter-wave on the small  
10 cells in this Woodbridge area.

11 MR. NGUYEN: Yes.

12 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): And so that was  
13 my answer is that in this kind of topography and  
14 this kind of morphology, is what we call it,  
15 where, you know, where the houses are so far apart  
16 and with all the trees, it wouldn't make sense to  
17 deploy millimeter-wave. It would make a lot more  
18 sense to deploy the lower frequencies such as, you  
19 know, going from 700 all the way up to 3700  
20 megahertz.

21 MR. NGUYEN: And with respect to the  
22 commencement and completion dates, do you have the  
23 dates proposed for this tower construction?

24 THE WITNESS (Parks): This is Tim Parks  
25 from Cellco. I don't think we do at this time.

1 It would likely be -- we would likely start  
2 construction not long after receiving full  
3 approval.

4 MR. NGUYEN: And do you have any idea  
5 when you start how long it would take to complete  
6 the project?

7 THE WITNESS (Parks): This is Tim Parks  
8 with Cellco. A raw land monopole install would  
9 typically take anywhere between five and seven  
10 months to fully complete.

11 MR. NGUYEN: Okay. Thank you very  
12 much. That's all I have, Mr. Morissette. Thank  
13 you.

14 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. Nguyen.  
15 I see that Mr. Lynch is no longer connected, so  
16 we'll move on to Ms. Cooley.

17 Ms. Cooley, do you have any questions?

18 MS. COOLEY: Thank you. Yes, I just  
19 have a few questions. First of all, one of your  
20 rationales for this tower is that in this area you  
21 mentioned that you have many people requesting  
22 network extenders, you said a large number. Can  
23 you tell me how many that is, what's a large  
24 number?

25 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): This is Ziad

1 Cheiban. I don't have the number of network  
2 extenders off the top of my head, but I know that  
3 we've tallied about more than 30 customer  
4 complaints in the last two to three years in this  
5 area, and typically those are customer complaints,  
6 you know, about coverage in their home or on the  
7 roads in the area. So I would say roughly about  
8 30 network extenders.

9 MS. COOLEY: Okay. So the network  
10 extenders are for people in homes that are  
11 complaining, not on the roads, right, is that  
12 correct?

13 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): Ms. Cooley, I'm  
14 not sure if you're hearing me, but yes, that is  
15 correct.

16 MS. COOLEY: Yes. Sorry, I could not  
17 hear you. Thank you. Okay. My other question  
18 too is to go back to the small cell issue. One of  
19 your solutions for that area in the north that is  
20 not going to be -- would not be fully covered  
21 would be to use small cells along, is it Route 63?  
22 How many would you think you would need?

23 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): This is Ziad  
24 Cheiban again. At this time we are planning to  
25 deploy just one small cell to fill a small gap on,

1 I believe it is Route 67.

2 MS. COOLEY: Okay. So just the one.  
3 But you don't have that site figured out yet?

4 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): Not yet.

5 MS. COOLEY: Not yet, okay. I think  
6 that covers my questions. Most of them had been  
7 asked previously. Thank you.

8 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Ms. Cooley.

9 I have a couple of follow-up questions.  
10 The first one is relating to the monopine topic  
11 that Mr. Mercier brought up earlier in his  
12 cross-examination. Now, my understanding is that  
13 the proposed tower has been reduced to 100 feet.  
14 Are you still planning to have a total of four  
15 carriers on the tower at 100 feet?

16 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Mr.  
17 Morissette, this is Mike Libertine I'm not sure  
18 we can really answer that. I mean, it certainly  
19 will be designed and constructed to hold  
20 physically that equipment, but that's really up to  
21 each of the carriers whether or not they need this  
22 facility and then at what centerline they would  
23 need.

24 MR. MORISSETTE: Yes, that actually is  
25 in line with my questioning is, if you lower the

1 top down to 100 feet, then the lower facility will  
2 be at approximately 60 feet, and is that height  
3 too low for a fourth carrier? I know you can't  
4 answer that for a carrier, but hypothetically from  
5 an RF perspective would that be an issue?

6 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): This is Ziad  
7 Cheiban. It could very well be an issue, but, you  
8 know, it would depend on what frequencies that  
9 fourth carrier is deploying and, you know, how  
10 close their other sites are located, so it's hard  
11 to answer.

12 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Mr.  
13 Morissette to that point I just want to make sure  
14 it's on the record that, and I don't want to speak  
15 for Ziad, but having worked on this project for  
16 the last several years, it's clear that we have,  
17 or Verizon has made a significant compromise in  
18 terms of height. 140 is really the height that  
19 would be ideal. It would eliminate the need for a  
20 fill-in site somewhere to the north along Route 67  
21 with a small cell. But we've heard from the town  
22 and the community, and so the reduction to 100  
23 feet serves Verizon's basic minimum needs, but  
24 there is a major compromise. And so I just want  
25 to make sure everyone kind of -- I think that's

1 been lost a little bit in the testimony so far.  
2 And it kind of goes to that point whether or not  
3 60 or 70 feet above ground level would really work  
4 for someone else.

5 MR. MORISSETTE: Yes. Thank you. I  
6 can see that that would put a limitation on the  
7 fourth, and possibly third carrier, going forward.  
8 Thank you for that clarification.

9 THE WITNESS (Libertine): You're  
10 welcome.

11 MR. MORISSETTE: Mr. Libertine, while I  
12 have you, I would like, I think it's you, but I  
13 would like to go to the visibility analysis, or is  
14 that Mr. Gaudet?

15 THE WITNESS (Libertine): It will  
16 probably be a combination of the two of us.

17 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay, great. Let's  
18 see here. Going on to photo 2, I see the crane  
19 with a balloon on it. Is the 100 feet where the  
20 balloon is, is that a balloon?

21 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): It's actually  
22 the hoist of the crane. So at this point we had  
23 gone out to evaluate, the main purpose here was to  
24 evaluate 100 feet. But with the original height  
25 being at 140 feet, those photos were not in a full

1 leaf-off situation. So we wanted to, one,  
2 evaluate 100 feet; but two, compare while we were  
3 out there at the 140 feet, if we saw any  
4 differences in the leaf-off condition. So what  
5 you see here, we also wanted to evaluate 120, is  
6 the top of the crane at 140 feet. We dropped a  
7 hoist down with a flag on that to 120 feet  
8 approximately, and then what we did was scale back  
9 based off that 140 foot to the 100 foot level that  
10 you see there.

11 MR. MORISSETTE: Great. Thank you for  
12 that clarification. So the second photo 2 is at  
13 100 feet which looks a little lower than 100 feet  
14 from the previous photo 2. Can you comment on  
15 that, or is that pretty accurate?

16 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): It's pretty  
17 accurate. That hoist ended up probably a little  
18 bit above 120 feet. So I think it's the visual  
19 gap between where the hoist is to the top of the  
20 boom appears to be a little bit less than what  
21 that, you know, if you do that sort of quick flip,  
22 as I can see you're looking at it on the computer,  
23 it's a little bit easier than the paper, that I  
24 think is what's explaining that sort of  
25 discrepancy. And you'll see that in a handful of

1 other photos as well.

2 MR. MORISSETTE: Great. Thank you.  
3 Moving on to photo 9, I don't know if it's my  
4 computer resolution or what, but I can't see the  
5 frame or I can't see the tower.

6 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): It's there. I  
7 think if those red arrows weren't there, it would  
8 be pretty difficult to see. You know, we go out  
9 there and drive these sites. And we've got a  
10 trained eye, we're specifically looking for these.  
11 I think this photo is a great example of what your  
12 sort of typical seasonal views will look like as  
13 you are driving down these streets. This photo I  
14 know specifically I had to drive back and forth  
15 about six times to figure out where it was and  
16 where it dropped out because of the intervening  
17 trees, but you can see it if you're standing  
18 essentially in front of one mailbox there.

19 MR. MORISSETTE: I see the red arrow  
20 now. Unfortunately, it's buried in the trees so  
21 the contrast is not -- but I do see it. Thank  
22 you.

23 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Sure.

24 MR. MORISSETTE: I think I had the same  
25 question for 12.

1                   THE WITNESS (Libertine): Mr.  
2 Morissette, this is Mike Libertine.

3                   MR. MORISSETTE: Yes.

4                   THE WITNESS (Libertine): Obviously,  
5 you know, what we try to do is to present a pretty  
6 fair representation of all the different types of  
7 views. These are static in nature, so they do  
8 tend to at times create, I guess, the illusion  
9 that there may not even be anything there that  
10 we're looking at. But as Mr. Gaudet said, we have  
11 a trained eye. We also use binoculars a lot even  
12 at this near range because it is oftentimes hard  
13 to find the boom or even a red balloon depending  
14 upon where we are.

15                   But again, what we're really trying to  
16 show is that there are some seasonal views, but I  
17 think the characteristics in this area are such  
18 that they are fairly well screened even with the  
19 deciduous trees there today. I think what's  
20 complicated this, and maybe made it a little bit  
21 hard to follow, is that we did have the boom 40  
22 feet taller than what the ultimate tower is  
23 proposed at and what the simulation shows. So it  
24 can be a little bit confusing when you try and  
25 compare the two shots.

1 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you for that. I  
2 do see 12. And I was looking at 22, I just  
3 couldn't see that one either.

4 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Yeah, 22, this  
5 one was one where the crane boom sticks out a  
6 little bit more. Again, if you're glancing past  
7 it, it appears almost like a tree branch. But  
8 again, as you look, you can see the dark outline  
9 of the proposed antenna array.

10 MR. MORISSETTE: Yes. Thank you. I do  
11 see it now. Okay. Great. Thank you. I just  
12 wanted to go quickly to Question 33 having to do  
13 with noise. And the table, it shows the property  
14 line and then the combined dBa. What is meant by  
15 the combined dBa, is that a cumulative effect of,  
16 for instance, the battery cabinet and the  
17 equipment cabinet without the generator or could  
18 you explain that for me?

19 THE WITNESS (Bhembe): The combined dBa  
20 is the combination of all, including the  
21 generator.

22 MR. MORISSETTE: So on the second line  
23 it says battery cabinet. So if it was the  
24 combined dBa, I would think that with the  
25 generator on and combined it would be somewhere in

1 the 51.6 dBa range.

2 THE WITNESS (Bhembe): That's correct,  
3 51.6.

4 MR. MORISSETTE: With the battery  
5 cabinet?

6 THE WITNESS (Bhembe): With the battery  
7 cabinet added to it.

8 MR. MORISSETTE: So the 25.2 is  
9 incorrect?

10 THE WITNESS (Bhembe): The 25.2 is from  
11 just the battery and the 25.2 again is for the  
12 equipment cabinet.

13 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. All right. I  
14 think I understand now. So each one the dBa  
15 limits are as identified for each of the pieces of  
16 equipment, and then the combined of all three  
17 pieces of equipment is the 51.6?

18 THE WITNESS (Bhembe): That is correct.

19 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay, I understand  
20 now. Thank you. I was a little confused by that.

21 I'd like to go to page 9 of the  
22 application. I was wondering, since we have a  
23 Late-File for Mr. Hannon, I believe, on the tower  
24 heights, when you're putting the information on  
25 the tower heights, if you could develop a table of

1 all the existing facilities because it's in  
2 paragraph form here on page 9, the existing  
3 surrounding cell towers, if you could make a table  
4 out of that and then include the tower heights on  
5 that same table. I'm getting confused as to where  
6 are all the facilities that are communicating with  
7 this new facility. Would that be possible?

8 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): Mr. Morissette,  
9 are you looking for the height of Verizon's  
10 antennas or the overall height of the towers?

11 MR. MORISSETTE: The question was from  
12 Mr. Hannon. He was asking for specific tower  
13 heights of certain facilities. What I'm asking  
14 for is, what I'd like to see is a table of all the  
15 existing surrounding cell sites that interact with  
16 the Woodbridge North 2 facility. So basically  
17 taking that paragraph and making it into a table.  
18 I think it would be helpful in identifying and  
19 understanding what other facilities are in the  
20 area.

21 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): Okay. We'll  
22 take that back.

23 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Okay. I'm  
24 going to jump back to Question 11 having to do  
25 with the small cells. The response, the first

1 sentence says, "It may be theoretically and  
2 technically possible to install a large number of  
3 small cells." What do you mean by "large number,"  
4 is it 5, 50, 100?

5 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): This is Ziad  
6 Cheiban. We have not done -- I mean, I don't have  
7 an exact number, but it would probably be  
8 somewhere in the vicinity of 20, 30, something  
9 like that.

10 MR. MORISSETTE: So it would be a  
11 significant number, it's not in the small range?

12 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): That is  
13 correct.

14 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. There was  
15 some correspondence as to the 1990 Litchfield  
16 Turnpike facility, and I didn't see it on your  
17 site search. I'm sure you're going to get some  
18 questions about that. But could you briefly  
19 explain whether you looked at it, and if you have  
20 or have not, what your high level view of it is?

21 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): This is Ziad  
22 Cheiban again. That facility is significantly  
23 outside of our search ring. It is at least two  
24 miles away from it. And, you know, we know that  
25 it wouldn't cover the area of concern for us.

1 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Thank you.  
2 Okay. That concludes my cross-examination. We  
3 will now continue with cross-examination of the  
4 applicant by Woodbridge Newton Neighborhood  
5 Environmental Trust, Attorney Ainsworth.

6 MR. AINSWORTH: Thank you, Mr.  
7 Chairman.

8 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you.

9 MR. AINSWORTH: So I guess I'm going to  
10 begin by going in reverse order. I'm going to  
11 start with the last question. The answer about  
12 1990 Litchfield Turnpike was that it would not  
13 cover the area of concern. Would it cover any  
14 portion of the area of concern?

15 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): I'll need to  
16 get back to you on that one to kind of measure  
17 like how much it would cover, but it would not  
18 cover -- it would barely cover any of the area  
19 that we are trying to improve.

20 MR. AINSWORTH: When you were making  
21 that assumption that it wouldn't -- that it's not  
22 likely to cover any of the area of concern, what  
23 height were you assuming that your antenna would  
24 be at?

25 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): That tower is,

1 I think, 175 feet, and it has AT&T already on it.  
2 So I think, at best, we would have to assume 120  
3 feet or so.

4 MR. AINSWORTH: Okay. If I told you  
5 that the tower is currently at 155 and AT&T  
6 occupies two spots or locations on that tower,  
7 which might theoretically be consolidated, if you  
8 were to take a 145 slot, are you able to model  
9 that to see what area it might cover?

10 MR. BALDWIN: Just before Ziad answers,  
11 I think I object to your speculation that AT&T  
12 might consolidate. There's no evidence in the  
13 record to suggest that they would consolidate.  
14 But I think what we can do, Attorney Ainsworth, is  
15 offer to take a look at that site and see what  
16 height was available and answer your first  
17 question which was how much of the coverage area  
18 for the Woodbridge North 2 site would be  
19 achievable from a particular height at 1990  
20 Litchfield Turnpike. Perhaps that's an  
21 appropriate compromise there.

22 MR. AINSWORTH: That might well be. I  
23 would also perhaps go back to the Council and  
24 suggest that optimization would be within their  
25 authority since tower sharing is part of their

1 charge.

2 MR. BALDWIN: Just so I'm clear, I'm  
3 sorry, Mr. Morissette, just so I'm clear, you are  
4 implying that the Siting Council has the ability  
5 to order AT&T to consolidate its antennas? I'm  
6 just trying to understand the question.

7 MR. AINSWORTH: Yes, that the tower  
8 could be optimized to avoid additional new  
9 facilities.

10 MR. MORISSETTE: At this point let's  
11 look at the information that's going to be filed  
12 by the applicant. And it's yet to be determined  
13 whether we have the authority to do as has been  
14 suggested, but we'll address that when we see the  
15 information. Thank you.

16 MR. AINSWORTH: Understood. Okay.  
17 When you mentioned the high concentration of Wi-Fi  
18 extenders, or extenders, you noted that the area  
19 had been the subject of a number of complaints  
20 from people on the roads and in the homes. How  
21 many of each did you receive in terms of  
22 complaints?

23 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): This is Ziad  
24 Cheiban. I do not have a breakdown of the  
25 complaints.

1 MR. AINSWORTH: Do you have any sense  
2 of the proportion of road complaints versus home  
3 complaints?

4 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): I do not.

5 MR. AINSWORTH: So, if you're saying  
6 that you had about 30 complaints and so it was  
7 about 30 extenders and you don't know the  
8 percentage of ones generated on the road or from a  
9 home, then how would you know what proportion of  
10 those complaints would result in an extender being  
11 deployed?

12 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): This is a  
13 question we can go back and try to come up with  
14 the numbers for.

15 MR. AINSWORTH: Thank you. That would  
16 be helpful. In terms of the, did you measure the  
17 gap for 700 megahertz versus 850 megahertz  
18 frequencies for Verizon, or should I say did you  
19 model it?

20 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): Yes, we did  
21 model it, and those propagation plots were  
22 submitted.

23 MR. AINSWORTH: Okay.

24 MR. BALDWIN: Just to clarify, Attorney  
25 Ainsworth, the gaps in service, where are you

1 referring to in particular, are these the gaps  
2 that remain with the 100 foot tower?

3 MR. AINSWORTH: I was talking about the  
4 gaps that are being targeted for coverage by this  
5 proposal.

6 MR. BALDWIN: Okay. So it's existing  
7 gaps as they are today?

8 MR. AINSWORTH: Correct, yes.

9 MR. BALDWIN: Okay.

10 MR. AINSWORTH: And with regard to the  
11 number of small cells that you projected might be  
12 required to cover the target coverage area, your  
13 answer was approximately 20 to 30 or in that  
14 range. Did you do any modeling to determine how  
15 those would be distributed?

16 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): This is Ziad  
17 Cheiban again. So the design of the small cells  
18 has to depend on where we have existing poles, and  
19 so we can work backwards from where we see a pole  
20 that is usable, is unencumbered by other  
21 electrical equipment, and work our way backwards  
22 to what kind of design we can achieve.

23 MR. AINSWORTH: And are you aware that  
24 there's a law that requires DOT to make available  
25 state road right of ways for small cell

1 deployments?

2 MR. BALDWIN: While I'll object to the  
3 question, I'm not sure that Mr. Cheiban can answer  
4 legal questions related to what laws may exist.

5 MR. AINSWORTH: Okay. Is the Verizon  
6 team aware that it has the ability to locate on  
7 state routes as a result of recent legislation?

8 MR. BALDWIN: I think it's just a  
9 different way of asking the same question. Could  
10 you identify the particular piece of legislation  
11 you're speaking about?

12 MR. AINSWORTH: I could, if I could  
13 remember from Docket 488 in which it was submitted  
14 as an administrative notice item. But I will  
15 submit that later for the second hearing so that  
16 we can discuss that at greater length.

17 Does Verizon have the ability to locate  
18 its small cells within the municipal road right of  
19 ways?

20 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): This is Ziad  
21 Cheiban. That would depend on the municipality,  
22 if they, you know, it's basically their decision.

23 MR. BALDWIN: Can we go off the record,  
24 please?

25 MR. MORISSETTE: Yes, please.

1 (Off the record discussion.)

2 MR. AINSWORTH: I will say for the  
3 record that it's highly unusual for someone to go  
4 off the record while a question is pending. It  
5 sounds a lot like coaching.

6 MR. BALDWIN: I'm just trying to make  
7 sure we get an answer to your question, Mr.  
8 Ainsworth. Go ahead.

9 MR. MORISSETTE: Please continue.

10 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): So, I'm sorry,  
11 Attorney Ainsworth, can you clarify your question?

12 MR. AINSWORTH: Yes. Does Verizon have  
13 the ability to locate its small cell facilities or  
14 its utility installations within municipal road  
15 right of ways?

16 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): So from a  
17 technical standpoint, we can -- you're talking  
18 about putting a new pole, say, a wood pole or a  
19 steel pole within the municipal right of ways?

20 MR. AINSWORTH: Yes, correct.

21 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): Yes, we do. I  
22 mean, technically it is feasible. We'd need to go  
23 in front of the Siting Council to get approval for  
24 every one of those poles.

25 MR. AINSWORTH: And, in fact, Verizon

1 has sought such approval on many occasions for  
2 small cells before either PURA or the Siting  
3 Council, correct?

4 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): I'm not sure  
5 I'm the right person to address legal issues, but  
6 new poles are subject to Siting Council  
7 jurisdiction. Existing utility poles are subject  
8 to PURA.

9 MR. AINSWORTH: Okay. And so you are  
10 before the Siting Council, you could seek approval  
11 for an array of small cells all at once so it  
12 wouldn't require a series of applications,  
13 correct?

14 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): I'll defer to  
15 our attorney.

16 MR. BALDWIN: I'm not sure that Mr.  
17 Cheiban is capable of answering that question  
18 about how he would proceed through a Siting  
19 Council application, nor am I, necessarily, do I  
20 understand why it's relevant.

21 MR. AINSWORTH: Just for relevancy  
22 purposes, it's just a matter of indicating that  
23 it's easier than that might be suggested by the  
24 answer that it might require a series of  
25 applications as opposed to a single one.

1 MR. MORISSETTE: Please continue.

2 MR. AINSWORTH: I will. Thank you.

3 One of the limitations that you cited in small  
4 cells for utility pole installations was that  
5 there was a limitation on the number of frequency  
6 deployments that you could put on, limited to two  
7 different frequency bands, but it would be  
8 possible to locate on two different poles to allow  
9 for the other frequencies that you operate on,  
10 correct?

11 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): This is Ziad  
12 Cheiban again. Yes, that is correct. However, as  
13 I mentioned earlier, there are very, very few  
14 poles that are not encumbered by electrical  
15 equipment in this area. So having to deploy on  
16 even more poles would increase the difficulty.

17 MR. AINSWORTH: Okay. And did you do a  
18 survey of the number of poles that are  
19 unencumbered?

20 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): I did do a  
21 desktop evaluation to look at available poles.

22 MR. AINSWORTH: And how many did you  
23 find were so unencumbered?

24 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): I don't have an  
25 exact number, but as I mentioned, there are very

1 few.

2 MR. AINSWORTH: Are you able to install  
3 backup power on a small cell?

4 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): United  
5 Illuminating poles, no, we are not.

6 MR. AINSWORTH: And so that would  
7 include batteries and/or propane, or maybe I  
8 should ask the question what is the limitation  
9 with regard to United Illuminating poles?

10 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): This is Ziad  
11 Cheiban again. The contract, the agreement that  
12 we have with United Illuminating precludes us from  
13 deploying such equipment.

14 MR. AINSWORTH: Is it on safety grounds  
15 or some other ground?

16 MR. BALDWIN: I object. Mr. Cheiban is  
17 not someone who could answer that question. It's  
18 a master license agreement between Verizon and the  
19 electric distribution company. As to why UI has  
20 imposed restrictions, it's not something that we  
21 can answer.

22 MR. AINSWORTH: Fair enough.  
23 Mr. Gustafson mentioned that with regard to one of  
24 the sites owned by the Regional Water Authority he  
25 said there was a conservation easement and there

1 was a public water supply watershed. Have you  
2 ever located a Verizon facility within a public  
3 water supply watershed?

4 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Dean  
5 Gustafson. I have not been involved in a site  
6 that's been constructed on a public water supply  
7 watershed.

8 MR. AINSWORTH: And is there -- do you  
9 know the reason why that's the case, is it just  
10 happenstance, or was there a particular technical  
11 reason for that?

12 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): The projects  
13 I've been involved in the past that have involved  
14 water supply watershed areas, the water company or  
15 the water authority involved did not agree to  
16 terms with Verizon to allow for it to proceed.

17 MR. AINSWORTH: And there was some  
18 testimony regarding land trust properties having,  
19 or municipal properties, it wasn't entirely clear,  
20 that had conservation easements. Did anyone  
21 within the team review the terms of the  
22 conservation easements to determine the  
23 limitations that those easements imposed on the  
24 property?

25 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): I was not

1 provided with any documentation from the town with  
2 respect to the conservation easement restrictions.

3 MR. AINSWORTH: So at this point you're  
4 unaware of whether those conservation easements  
5 would be an impediment to the placement of a  
6 wireless tower?

7 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): That's  
8 correct.

9 MR. AINSWORTH: And I was asking the  
10 question earlier about the 20 to 30 small cells.  
11 When you were estimating that rough number, were  
12 you talking about covering the entire gap that  
13 you're trying to cover with this tower or some  
14 portion of it?

15 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): This is Ziad  
16 Cheiban. I was referring to providing similar  
17 coverage to what would be provided by the proposed  
18 tower.

19 MR. AINSWORTH: So if you had another  
20 facility which would cover a portion of the area  
21 that you're targeting, it would require fewer  
22 small cells, correct?

23 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): I guess it  
24 would depend on what the other facility covers.

25 MR. AINSWORTH: Now, with regard to

1 both the access drive to the facility within the  
2 host parcel and the location of the tower on the  
3 host parcel, both of those were chosen by the host  
4 proprietor and not Verizon?

5 THE WITNESS (Parks): Could you repeat  
6 that again?

7 MR. AINSWORTH: Yes. Okay. The site  
8 is accessed by a drive off of the cul-de-sac on  
9 Soundview, but the property currently has an  
10 existing driveway off of Newton Road. Why was the  
11 driveway on Newton Road not chosen to access the  
12 site?

13 THE WITNESS (Parks): This is where our  
14 landlord directed us to. He wanted to lease on  
15 that portion.

16 MR. AINSWORTH: So, is it safe to  
17 assume that Verizon had no technical reason for  
18 choosing the Soundview access as opposed to Newton  
19 Road?

20 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Brian Gaudet  
21 with All-Points. It's a much shorter access drive  
22 with substantially less increase in grade from  
23 Newton Road up to the proposed facility. It is a  
24 currently, I would say, relatively unimproved dirt  
25 road. So I think there would be some

1 substantially more upgrade needed from that  
2 portion considering the drainage and the grading  
3 there.

4 THE WITNESS (Libertine): This is Mike  
5 Libertine. It's also a much shorter run for the  
6 electrical and telco into that, much less ground  
7 disturbance for going underground.

8 MR. AINSWORTH: Is it possible to run  
9 the electrical connections through one side and  
10 the vehicular access through another?

11 THE WITNESS (Libertine):  
12 Theoretically, sure.

13 MR. AINSWORTH: And with regard to the  
14 location of the tower within the parcel, you were  
15 also directed by the landowner to that location as  
16 opposed to somewhere else on the property,  
17 correct?

18 THE WITNESS (Parks): Tim Parks from  
19 Cellco. That is the agreed location that worked  
20 for both parties.

21 MR. AINSWORTH: Okay. When you say it  
22 "worked for both parties," did the landowner  
23 provide you with other alternatives within the  
24 site other than the one that was proposed?

25 THE WITNESS (Parks): Tim Parks from

1 Cellco. Unfortunately, I -- can we go off the  
2 record? This worked for both of us. I'm not sure  
3 that we were actually given a second location to  
4 look at.

5 MR. BALDWIN: I'll just add, Mr.  
6 Ainsworth, Mr. Parks was not involved during the  
7 negotiations of the agreement with the property  
8 owner. Perhaps we could look into that a little  
9 bit further and see if this was a, you know, if  
10 there were other alternative locations on the  
11 property that Mr. Parks is not aware of that might  
12 answer your question more precisely.

13 MR. AINSWORTH: Okay. Were there any  
14 limitations from Cellco's perspective regarding  
15 the site for locating the tower elsewhere, or  
16 could this tower have gone pretty much anywhere on  
17 the site from your perspective?

18 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): This is Ziad  
19 Cheiban with Verizon. The property owners own  
20 several parcels in this area. The terrain kind of  
21 slopes down from where we are currently located.  
22 So if we were to move it to different parcels, we  
23 would need to build a taller tower to compensate  
24 for the loss in terrain elevation. I was also at  
25 a site walk with the property owner, and he didn't

1 want us to locate on other parcels. In addition,  
2 and I think Brian or Mike can speak to this in  
3 more detail, it would require a lot more tree  
4 clearing to locate somewhere else than where we  
5 currently are proposing.

6 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): This is Brian  
7 Gaudet with All-Points. From a standpoint of  
8 visible screening that's existing there today,  
9 I'll point you to the aerial in the remote field  
10 review, the photo log. To the east towards Newton  
11 Road there is existing trees that screen this.  
12 This area is essentially cut back into that  
13 southern treeline. I will then also point you to  
14 photo 6. The property owner still uses this land.  
15 I can't speak for what farming purposes, whether  
16 it be personal planting, maybe he's grown some  
17 fruits and vegetables. But photo 6 you can see  
18 south of the access drive, or sorry, east of the  
19 access drive towards the residence and the  
20 outbuildings he is currently using that area for  
21 his own farming purposes. And I believe  
22 historically this was an apple farm.

23 MR. AINSWORTH: Okay. Is it your  
24 understanding that this is currently a farm?

25 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Brian Gaudet.

1 It is not my understanding that it is currently a  
2 farm. Being on site and speaking with the  
3 property owner who's been there for a number of  
4 years, historically it was an apple farm, I  
5 believe, back in his family when he was younger.  
6 They have since halted the apple farm business  
7 that they had there, but it is very clearly still  
8 used in some capacity, I would assume, on a  
9 personal level. I can't speak to whether the  
10 property owner has a business running a farm off  
11 of that property.

12 MR. AINSWORTH: Are you aware of what  
13 the zoning is for that parcel?

14 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Brian Gaudet.  
15 Yes, it's residential zone A, I believe.

16 MR. AINSWORTH: And are you aware that  
17 the zoning was changed from agriculture to  
18 residential by the owner?

19 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): I am not aware  
20 of that. I don't believe that would preclude an  
21 individual from doing some planting of their own.  
22 I have a small vegetable garden in my backyard in  
23 a residential neighborhood as well.

24 MR. AINSWORTH: That's perfectly fine,  
25 I'm sure. You're also not siting a cell tower

1 close to your neighbors.

2 With regard to the Meetinghouse Lane  
3 tower, did you do any coverage modeling for that  
4 location?

5 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): Specifically  
6 which Meetinghouse Lane property? There are  
7 several.

8 MR. AINSWORTH: The one next to the  
9 police station.

10 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): The existing  
11 tower?

12 MR. AINSWORTH: Yes.

13 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): I don't believe  
14 I have modeled it.

15 MR. AINSWORTH: Were you requested to,  
16 or was that suggested by the town during the  
17 course of the town consultation?

18 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): They suggested  
19 raw land built on the Meetinghouse lane property  
20 but not the existing tower.

21 MR. AINSWORTH: There was some mention  
22 earlier about, or there was some questions by Mr.  
23 Morissette regarding the possible co-location of  
24 other carriers on this tower. How many carriers  
25 are currently operating in Connecticut doing

1 wireless facilities?

2 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): This is Ziad  
3 Cheiban. I'll take the question. There are  
4 currently, we're down to three carriers.

5 MR. AINSWORTH: Okay.

6 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): With  
7 potentially a fourth in the making, but currently  
8 it's AT&T, T-Mobile and Verizon.

9 MR. AINSWORTH: Okay. And so how many  
10 carriers are interested in co-locating on this  
11 particular tower since you've filed the  
12 application?

13 THE WITNESS (Parks): This is Tim Parks  
14 with Cellco. As of right now we don't have one.

15 MR. AINSWORTH: With regard to the one  
16 particular small cell that you are currently  
17 proposing to deploy, did you model the coverage  
18 from that small cell?

19 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): This is Ziad  
20 Cheiban. We don't have a location determined yet,  
21 but when that does happen we will model it.

22 MR. AINSWORTH: Okay. So did you make  
23 some assumption about the footprint that you would  
24 be able to achieve with that theoretical small  
25 cell?

1           THE WITNESS (Cheiban): That is  
2 correct.

3           MR. AINSWORTH: And were you making an  
4 assumption of which frequency band that it would  
5 be transmitting?

6           THE WITNESS (Cheiban): I have not made  
7 a determination on that yet.

8           MR. AINSWORTH: I guess then do you  
9 have any -- how do you have a sense that that  
10 proposed small cell would satisfy the needs that  
11 you have to complete the coverage that you're  
12 looking for?

13          THE WITNESS (Cheiban): I mean, we know  
14 we have -- we know how large of a gap we have, and  
15 we're basically trying to fill that gap.

16          MR. AINSWORTH: Is it that you haven't  
17 been able to locate a pole that the host owner of  
18 the pole finds acceptable, or have you just not  
19 located a pole that was free from electrical  
20 encumbrances, or haven't you gotten to that level  
21 of specificity?

22          THE WITNESS (Cheiban): This is Ziad  
23 Cheiban again. We follow the same process as  
24 usual. We issue the search ring and request from  
25 our site acquisition team to search for a pole, a

1 suitable pole in the area.

2 MR. AINSWORTH: Has that search been  
3 initiated?

4 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): It has.

5 MR. AINSWORTH: How long does it  
6 typically take to locate a suitable pole?

7 THE WITNESS (Cheiban): It depends. I  
8 don't know.

9 MR. AINSWORTH: And please forgive me,  
10 I'm going through my notes. (Pause) That is all  
11 I have at this time. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

12 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney  
13 Ainsworth.

14 We will continue with cross-examination  
15 of the applicant by the Town of Woodbridge.  
16 Attorney Bamonte.

17 MR. BAMONTE: Thank you, Mr.  
18 Morissette. No questions from the town at this  
19 time.

20 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney  
21 Bamonte. At this point, I think it's a good time  
22 to break for dinner, and we will return at 6:30  
23 for the public comment session. And we will  
24 commence at 6:30. Thank you, everyone. Have a  
25 good dinner and we'll see everyone then. Thank

1 you.

2 (Whereupon, the witnesses were excused  
3 and the hearing adjourned at 4:42 p.m.)  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1 CERTIFICATE FOR REMOTE HEARING

2  
3 I hereby certify that the foregoing 105 pages  
4 are a complete and accurate computer-aided  
5 transcription of my original stenotype notes taken  
6 of the REMOTE PUBLIC HEARING IN RE: DOCKET NO.  
7 502, CELLCO PARTNERSHIP d/b/a VERIZON WIRELESS  
8 APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF ENVIRONMENTAL  
9 COMPATIBILITY AND PUBLIC NEED FOR THE  
10 CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE, AND OPERATION OF A  
11 TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITY LOCATED AT 118 NEWTON  
12 ROAD, WOODBRIDGE, CONNECTICUT, which was held  
13 before JOHN MORISSETTE, PRESIDING OFFICER, on July  
14 13, 2021.

15  
16  
17 

18 -----  
19 Lisa L. Warner, CSR 061  
20 Court Reporter  
21 BCT REPORTING, LLC  
22 55 WHITING STREET, SUITE 1A  
23 PLAINVILLE, CONNECTICUT 06062  
24  
25

I N D E X

WITNESSES: (Sworn on page 17)

ZIAD CHEIBAN  
TIMOTHY PARKS  
SYLVESTER BHEMBE  
MICHAEL LIBERTINE  
BRIAN GAUDET  
DEAN GUSTAFSON

EXAMINERS:

	PAGE
Mr. Baldwin (Direct)	18
Mr. Mercier (Start of cross)	23
Mr. Silvestri	50
Mr. Hannon	61
Mr. Nguyen	67
Ms. Cooley	72
Mr. Morissette	74
Mr. Ainsworth	84

APPLICANT'S EXHIBITS  
(Received in evidence)

EXHIBIT	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
II-B-1	Application for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need filed by Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless, received May 13, 2021, and attachments and bulk file exhibits including: Bulk file exhibits: a. Technical report b. Zoning regulations for the Town of Woodbridge c. Town of Woodbridge Inland Wetlands and Watercourses regulations d. Town of Woodbridge 2015-25 Plan of Conservation and Development	23
II-B-2	Applicant's Affidavit of Publication, dated May 24, 2021	23
II-B-3	Signed protective order, dated June 3, 2021	23
II-B-4	Applicant's responses to Council interrogatories, Set One, dated June 30, 2021	23
II-B-5	Sign posting affidavit	23
II-B-6	Revised viewshed map	23